

# THE RADICAL.

---

SEPTEMBER, 1871.

---

## THE PARIS COMMUNE.

**T**HE PARIS COMMUNE: its history and meaning.

To begin, I take the story of "The New-York Tribune:" abridging, but nowhere altering, "The Tribune's" reports. In the accompanying notes I make such additions and corrections as I find fairly authenticated in the various Paris journals of the same dates.

PARIS, March 9, 1871. The Committee of the Bordeaux Assembly reports in favor of removing to Fontainebleau. Thiers persists in preferring Versailles.

MARCH 10. A private dispatch from Paris states that the National Guards are strongly intrenched in Montmartre, with thirty-three guns, awaiting the signal of their leaders to proclaim open revolution in favor of the Commune; also threatening to dissolve the Assembly if it meets at Versailles. The Government is conciliatory.

MARCH 14. The insurgents have given in.

MARCH 16. They are scattering on account of the weather.

MARCH 17. The situation is unchanged. *No acts of violence have been committed.* After a council of war, Thiers issues a proclamation, and at midnight sends troops and gendarmes to surprise the insurgents, to take the thirty cannon, and to occupy

Montmartre. A number of cannon are removed and four hundred prisoners taken. Next morning —

SATURDAY, March 18. The National Guards of Belleville and Montmartre, with many unarmed soldiers of the line, release the prisoners. Gen. Vinoy's cordon of troops and mitrailleuses, commanding the approaches to Montmartre, is invaded by angry groups of citizens, who remonstrate with the soldiers, and a general fraternization takes place. The soldiers on the summit also fraternize with the Nationals, who are still guarding some of the cannon. As fresh troops arrive the people order them to "reverse arms," and are obeyed. At ten, A.M., the Nationals again hold the ground. In the Place Pigalle, at the end of a street leading to the heights, some artillerymen and chasseurs are surrounded by a mob taunting them with cries of, "Go and fight the Prussians!" A lieutenant, endeavoring to disengage himself, draws his sabre, and is dragged from his horse and killed. In the *melée* one artilleryman and two Nationals are wounded. The soldiers mingle with the crowd, distributing among them their cartridges and chassepots. Only the gendarmes remain faithful to the Government. They are too few to be effective, and are withdrawn. At eleven, A.M., not a soldier nor a gendarme is visible. At Lavalette also the troops fraternize, whole regiments surrendering their arms and refusing to act against the insurgents. The purposes of the insurgents are still indefinite. Their main object just now is resistance to the Government. The crowds at Belleville and Montmartre are unanimous in their clamors against the Bordeaux Assembly. They demand its immediate dissolution, and the election of a new body which shall sit in Paris.

Further on the same report says that Gen. Faron was for several hours surrounded by the mob; but his troops proved faithful, took three barricades with the bayonet, and cut their way out. Gen. Paturel was wounded. Gen. Vinoy was hissed and pelted; also was shot. Gens. Lecomte and Thomas, abandoned by their men, were taken prisoners. Lecomte was killed, and Thomas taken before a drum-head court-martial and shot. Gen. "Paladines" was taken prisoner to the rebel headquarters. Many gendarmes were killed. The horse of a staff-officer was

killed, cut up, and eaten. The troops succeeded in capturing forty cannon, and the people retook five without fighting. The remainder were removed to a place of safety. Gen. Vinoy's staff, all troops of the line, and the entire force of gendarmes, returned to the left bank of the Seine, *leaving the National Guards to restore order on the right.*

After the morning's failure, Thiers issues another proclamation, repudiating any intention of a *coup d'état*, warning *the Communists who seek to pillage Paris* that they will ruin France, and appealing to the National Guards to put an end to the anarchy into which they have plunged the Capital.\*

(The above is in the very words — only abridged — of "The Tribune's" correspondent, and contains the whole story of March 18 as given in "The Tribune" of Monday, March 20.)

The latest news (from London) is that the Nationals of Montmartre have seized the headquarters of the National Guards of Paris.†

MARCH 21. The situation unchanged. Fresh barricades, but general quietude. Omnibuses not running, and traffic ceased. The Nationals occupy forts Issy, Vanvres, and Bicetre. The Police Commissioners are arrested. The Central Committee, in its official journal of the 20th, publishes the following: "*A manifesto, originating in the suffrages of two hundred and fifteen battalions of the National Guard, repudiates disturbance. The Government calumniates Paris and arms the Provinces. It imposes upon us a commander, attempts night disarmings, removes the capital. . . . The Nationals have participated in no crime.*" The journal also orders elections on the 22d, and announces that the Committee will abdicate on the election of

\* He himself cuts off telegraphic communication between Paris and the Provinces, and boasts in his proclamation of Vinoy's forty thousand men. He writes to the Prefects of Departments that the generals are returning from Germany, and that Canrobert has offered his sword, — Canrobert, who, on the 2d of December, grape-shotted women and children in Montmartre. For "the anarchy" take this, from *La Commune*, Paris, March 21: "Yesterday (Monday) the Exchange opened as usual, in spite of orders sent expressly from Versailles."

† Implying that the revolt is only of a section of Paris, — the working-men's districts of Belleville and Montmartre.

a new one. It declares its respect for the preliminaries of peace, and invites adhesions from the Departments. It repudiates all participation in the execution of Gens. Lecomte and Thomas.\*

The Nationals "completely possess the whole city." Gen. Clancy is maltreated by the mob; sent to the hospital; confined in prison; released by the Committee. Many persons are shot without trial. "The Nationals *will* shoot M. Thiers and Gens. Vinoy and D'Aurelles if they should be captured." Strong reaction among the respectable inhabitants. The Central Committee, alarmed thereat, seeks the mediation of "the Mayor of the city" for the appointment of Admiral Saisset to the command of the National Guard.† The insurgent journals declare a willingness to treat with the Versailles Government on the following conditions: "*The election of a COMMUNAL COUNCIL ‡ by the people of Paris; reorganization of the National Guard, with power to elect and remove their own officers; and suppression of the Prefecture of Police.*"§ The "army journals" declare Thiers the author of the trouble. The editors of the Paris journals oppose the ordered elections, and call upon the National Guard to come forward and put an end to the deplorable state of affairs.|| The Versailles Government addresses a circular to the Prefects of Departments, informing them that the revolution, dishonored by its criminal acts, is unanimously disavowed; that the Assembly also disavows it.¶ The Mayors of Paris —

\* L'Opinion National says that Lecomte was shot by his own soldiers, whom he had threatened to shoot for fraternizing with the National Guards. A Versailles paper mentions a corporal of the Eighty-eighth Regiment.

† There is no "Mayor of the city." Saisset was so unpopular that not a battalion would follow him. It was he who, in the Assembly, spoke for calling on the Provinces to march against Paris, "and so have done with it."

‡ So in The Tribune, for all the editor's after-ignorance of anything except "Communism."

§ The Imperial Prefecture.

|| "Two hundred and fifteen" battalions — out of two hundred and sixty-five — having already come forward *for* the Commune.

¶ Saying nothing of the protests of the Representatives of Paris. Altogether a most disingenuous and lying circular.



the circular also says — protest and refuse to carry out, the illegal orders for the *Communal* elections; and the Nationals only demand the nomination of Saisset. The Government promises the speedy intervention of the army.

MARCH 22. A large number of unarmed persons attempt to pass the lines guarded by the Nationals. Refused passage, and, "retreating too slowly," three ranks of the Nationals filed out and fired, killing or wounding thirty persons. "The Nationals have since been re-enforced, and are orderly."\* The Nationals, under the order of "the Central Republican Committee," occupy Fort Vincennes unopposed, the garrison fraternizing. Gen. Cluseret has installed himself at the Ministry of War.† The Bourse is deserted. Reported that Gen. Raphael has been assassinated.

MARCH 24. Elections postponed. The commander of the insurgent Nationals justifies "the massacre" on the 22d, on the ground that the opposite party fired first. Rumored that Gen. Ducrot has been shot by his own soldiers. Admiral Saisset appointed commander of the orderly Nationals. The insurgent leaders losing control of their troops.

MARCH 26. The Central Committee, the Paris Deputies to the Assembly, and the Mayors and the Assistant Mayors of Arrondissements yesterday joined in a proclamation ordering elections for to-day, *urging all classes to vote*, and to give the vote a serious character, such as alone can insure the peace of the city.‡ The voting has passed off without disorder, and the

\* In the first instance, some one hundred and fifty men, with drum and cries of, "Down with the Commune!" parade the streets. These go unnoticed. Later, shots are fired; first by "the unarmed" demonstrators. Three Nationals were killed, and a dozen of "the party of order," who provoked and began the affray.

† The only committee as yet is "the Central Committee" of the National Guard, which has no "Ministry of War." Cluseret arrived in Paris on the 25th of March, and was appointed by the Communal Council on the 4th of April.

‡ The elections had been put off on account of the hesitation of some of the Mayors to co-operate with the Central Committee. In the *Mot d'Ordre* Rochefort says that the Committee invited them to take their place at the Hotel de Ville even so early as the night of the 19th; but they waited word

city is tranquil.\* The list of candidates endorsed by the Central Committee has been extensively distributed.† In the first from Versailles. Afterward, with few exceptions, they joined in the proclamation (that referred to by *The Tribune*) here following:—

FRENCH REPUBLIC.

LIBERTY—EQUALITY—FRATERNITY.

The Central Committee of the National Guard, to which have rallied the Deputies of Paris, the Mayors and Adjoints, convinced that the sole means to avoid civil war, the effusion of blood in Paris, and at the same time to consolidate [affermir] the Republic, is to proceed to immediate elections, convokes for to-morrow (Sunday) all the citizens in their electoral colleges.

The inhabitants of Paris will comprehend that under present circumstances patriotism obliges them all to come to vote, to the end that the elections may have that serious character which alone can assure peace to the city.

The bureaux will be open at eight in the morning and closed at midnight.

VIVE LA REPUBLIQUE!

Undersigned are the names of the Mayors and Assistant Mayors of seventeen arrondissements; the Representatives of the Seine present in Paris, — *Lockroy, Floquet, Tolain, Clemenceau, Schoelcher, Greppo*; and the Central Committee, — *Avoine, Arnaud, Arnold, Assi, Andignoux, Bouil, Bergeret, Babick, Barond, Billioray, Blanchet, Castioni, Chouteau, Dupont, Ferrat, Fortuné, Fabre, Fleury, Fougeret, Gaudier, Gouhier, Guiral, Geresme, Grollard, Josselin, Jourde, Lisbonne, Lavalette, Lullier, Maljournal, Moreau, Mortier, Prudhomme, Rousseau, Ravvier, Varlin, Viard.*

\* A warm sun, an azure sky, promenaders everywhere, in all the streets fresh toilets of women, cafés overflowing with customers, shops dressed out with their gayest wares, people going here and there on business across the crowd, groups in which calmness replaced the animation of the past week: such, traced in broad outlines, has been the general physiognomy of the day of voting.

The elections have been conducted quietly and in good order, but the interest (empressement) of the electors has not been very great; sometimes intermittences of a quarter of an hour between the ballots. Lively discussions between the citizens, some wanting to abstain, others considering silence as a crime. They talk, they grow warm, and that is all. — *Le Petit Journal*, Paris, March 28.

† There was no such list. The Committee distinctly refused to nominate or recommend any candidates. The election was absolutely free. Here is the list of the elected, in the order of the twenty arrondissements of Paris, as given in *Le Petit Journal* corrected by *Le Moniteur du Peuple*; perhaps not quite correct now:—

1. *Méline, Adam, Rochart, Barré.* 2. *Brelay, Loiseau Pinson, Tirard, Chéron.* 3. *Demay, ARNAUD, Pindy, Murat, Amoureux.* 4. *ARNOULD, Amoureux, Clémence, Gérardin, Lefrançais.* 5. *Règère, JOURDE, Tridon,*

arrondissement the present Mayor and Assistant-Mayor were candidates; other arrondissements made similar nominations.\* In a proclamation just issued the Central Republican Committee† resigns its functions and yields to the newly elected MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT. Barricades still are in the streets, but the cannon are turned inward. Shops open. Cabs running. The confidence of the people is reviving. Gens. Clancy and "Languoreau" are released. Menotti Garibaldi is appointed commander-in-chief.‡ Admiral Saisset called yesterday on all loyal citizens and soldiers to rally round him. To-day he disbands the loyal National Guards.§

MARCH 27. The candidates of the Central Republican Committee have been elected in all the arrondissements except three. The aggregate vote was very light. The "Journal de Paris" estimates the number of qualified voters who abstained from voting at two hundred and fifty thousand. In the second arrondissement, with twenty-two thousand eight hundred and fifty-three registered electors, twenty-one thousand one hundred and eighty votes were cast, seventeen thousand one hundred and eighty of these *against the Committee*. "The Daily News" (London), of same date, reports that "the elections passed off quietly, and resulted in an overwhelming Communist majority."

Later reports (in next day's "Tribune"): It is expected that

BLANCHET, Ledroit. 6. Leroy, Goupil, VARLIN, Beslay, Robinet. 7. Parisel, Lefevre, Urbain, Brunel, Libeancourt. 8. Raoul-Rigault, ARNOULD, Vaillant, Allix. 9. Ranc, Desmarest, Parent, Ferry. 10. Pyat, FORTUNÉ, Gambon, Champy, BABICK. 11. MORTIER, Delescluze, Endes, Verdure, Pretot, ASSI. 12. VARLIN, Theits, Frunceau, GERESME. 13. Meillet, Chardon, Frandel, Duval. 14. BILLIORAY, Martelet, Descamps. 15. Parisel, Lefevre, Urbain, Brunel. 16. Marmottan, De Bouteiller, Victor Hugo, Pyat. 17. VARLIN, E. Clement, Gérardin, Chalaïn. 18. Blanqui, Dereure, Ferré, Theisz, Vermorel, F. B. Clement, Grousset. 19. Oudet, Puget, Delescluze, Ostyn. 20. RANVIER, BERGERET, Blanqui, Flourens.

The names in small capitals are of members of the Central Committee.

\* Nominated and elected.

† The Central Committee (of the National Guard) again.

‡ Not one of the Garibaldis — father or sons — had any part in the movement, or was in Paris during the Commune.

§ Some three hundred out of two hundred thousand.

M. Blanqui will be President of the new government.\* Of five hundred thousand electors ONLY *two hundred thousand* voted for the Commune. Twenty members of the Committee elected. The conservatives successful only in the three wealthiest arrondissements. The rich generally abstained from voting, and the merchants voted the conservative ticket. The elected are mostly obscure men. The official journal says that "the first task of the newly elected *Municipality of Paris* will be the compilation of a charter that will secure the rights of the people, and prevent the representation of the large towns from being swamped by the country. . . . Matters essentially Parisian must be within the domain of the Commune."

MARCH 29. The Commune was proclaimed yesterday afternoon at the Hotel de Ville, an enormous crowd of National Guards zealously cheering the Republic.† A Sub-central Committee has replaced the old Central Committee.‡ Currently reported that a division has occurred in the Committee. Several members under arrest. Also one condemned to death as a Bonapartist. The Bank of France has again advanced five hundred thousand francs to the insurgents (one million before). The Postal Director refuses to give up his functions.§ Paris quiet. The red flag generally displayed. Menotti and Ricciotti Garibaldi have declined to fight except against a foreign enemy.

MARCH 30. The Sub-central Committee passed sentence of death upon "Wilfred" Fonvielle for being engaged in an at-

\* The Communal Council had no President. Blanqui, held in prison by the Thiers Government, for the affair of Oct. 31, was never in Paris during the Commune.

† The Commune of Paris is proclaimed. The members who compose it were yesterday acclaimed, in the Place of the Hotel de Ville, by two hundred thousand armed National Guards. At the hour in which we write the Central Committee has laid down its power, &c. Speeches by Assi and Lavalette. — *La Nouvelle République*, March 30.

‡ No such committee. The Central Committee returned to its original functions as Committee of the National Guard. Only some of its members were also members of the new Communal Council.

§ But deranged everything by going to Versailles, where Paris letters were detained and opened.

tempt against the existence of the Committee.\* Also an Executive Committee has been appointed by the Sub-central. It will have charge of affairs for a month. M. Blanqui is in hiding, and has not yet been present at any of the meetings at the Hotel de Ville.† It is stated that M. Delescluze has, in consequence of a declaration on the part of his colleagues that the position was incompatible with his dignity, resigned the membership of the *Communal Committee* to which he was chosen at the election of Sunday.‡ The Communists still disagree among themselves as to their future movements. The monthly salary of the Communist Councilors is fixed at three hundred francs.§

MARCH 31. "The Government has completed arrangements for moving against Paris. Learning this, the Commune have resolved to march upon Versailles."

#### ANOTHER REIGN OF TERROR THREATENED.

STARTLING DECREES ISSUED BY THE COMMITTEE — EVERY ABLE-BODIED MAN MUST FIGHT — THE PAYMENT OF RENTS SUSPENDED — PROPOSED SALE OF THE GOVERNMENT PALACES — THE GUILLOTINE TO BE ESTABLISHED AGAIN.

Under the above caption: A decree was made public abolishing the conscription, stating that no force except the National Guards will be introduced into Paris, and ordering that all able-bodied male citizens shall belong to the National Guard. Another decree remits lodgers' rents from October, 1870, to April, 1871, and says the rents to be paid shall be reckoned by months. The sale of all pawned articles is suspended.|| Another decree

\* No such committee. "Wilfred" perhaps means Ulric, the general, who was raising troops in the Provinces. On the strength of this, to-day's reports in The Tribune are headed: "*Arbitrary measures of the Central Committee — Its opponents to be shot — One already condemned to death.*"

† Why should "the President" be in hiding? Blanqui, who was not in Paris.

‡ He resigned his seat in the Versailles Assembly.

§ Not quite seventeen dollars a week. Tell it not in Washington. These men were "pillagers."

|| The preamble of these decrees: "Considering that labor, industry, and commerce have borne all the charges of the war, that it is just that property should bear its share of sacrifices for the country," &c.

orders all public officials, on pain of dismissal, to disregard orders from Versailles.\* Versailles documents are forbidden circulation. Paris grows sadder daily. One hundred and sixty thousand people have left the city in the last ten days. Chaplains are ordered to cease the performance of mass in the prisons. The insurance offices are searched for jewels and money of the Empress. The *Communal Council* holds its deliberations in private, but the following information has been divulged: An Executive Committee of seven members has been appointed; the Commune is divided into nine sections, — Finance, War, Justice, Safety, Subsistence, Education, Labor, Foreign, and Municipal.† The *Communal Council* is deliberating upon a proposal to pay the Prussian indemnity by the sale of Versailles, St. Cloud, and Fontainebleau. The evening edition of "The Times" (London) contains a letter saying that "measures of proscription were secretly enforced everywhere, and the significant word 'guillotine,' though spoken only in whispers, is in everybody's mouth."‡

After this date it is war.

APRIL 2. A movement is in progress to disarm and disband all battalions of Nationals which do not recognize the authority of the Commune.§ The National Guards as a body recognize the Commune. The party of order still hold possession of the Bank of France, which, however, "to save itself from being plundered," has advanced six million francs to the insurgents.

\* Not unnecessary, when the Postmaster-General had gone off to Versailles, and when the officials, under Versailles orders, had already disorganized the service of the octroi, the registration, public assistance, and marine, and had threatened to stop the gas. The reorganization by the Commune seems to have been good, economical and effective.

† The Paris journals give the organization of the Communal Council as follows: *Executive, War, Justice, General Surety, Subsistence, Labor (Industry and Exchange), External Relations, Public Services, Education.*

‡ Which reported letter is the only warrant for The Tribune editor's malicious caption, — "ANOTHER REIGN OF TERROR THREATENED — THE GUILLOTINE TO BE ESTABLISHED AGAIN."

§ On the contrary, the Paris journals complain of the insufficient arming of the National Guards, and the Communal Council appeals to the patriotism of citizens to supply the want by bringing their spare muskets for the use of those who have none.

APRIL 6. A proclamation announces retaliatory measures.

APRIL 7. Fearful slaughter on both sides, yesterday and to-day. Terror reigns. *The prisons are crowded. The churches and houses of the aristocrats are pillaged, and all priests imprisoned.* A great many murders have taken place.\*

APRIL 11. New efforts for conciliation are making in Paris, eighteen members of the Commune having declared themselves disposed to treat with the Versailles Government. The Commune hourly grows more desperate, and resorts to fierce excesses.

"The conciergerie is filled with priests and nuns who have been arrested on warrants calling them 'citizens styled the servants of a person called God.' Archbishop Darboy was stripped naked, bound to a pillar, and scourged and mocked for hours by a band of two hundred Reds."†

APRIL 11, MIDNIGHT. The insurgents *are said* to have made a demand upon the Church for one million francs, *and avow* that they will kill the Archbishop if it is not paid.‡

\* Turning to the Paris journals, for *and against* the Commune, of these first days of April, when "terror reigned," &c., I find: Only one murder has been committed in Paris during two months. Palm Sunday (April 2) celebrated in "all the churches" of Paris. "An inhabitant of the quarter" tells in one of the journals of the "déménagement à la Prussienne," by two hundred National Guards, of the house of the Prince de Wagram. I find no more outrages of these "Communists" *in Paris*; but outside they tell of eight Nationals taken prisoners by the Versaillists, who tie one to a horse's tail, and rip up (éventrer) another. And a girl's school, coming out of the church of Neuilly, is cut to pieces, *hashed*, by the Thiers grape-shot ("littéralement *hachée* par la mitraille").

Instead of "the churches are pillaged, and all priests imprisoned," read this: The Communal Council decrees the separation of Church and State, for Paris; suppresses the State allowance (budget des cultes); and declares the "biens dit de mortmain" and other church effects to be national property, *appointing an inquest concerning the same.*

† No doubt the same two hundred Reds who "prussianised" the house of the Prince de Wagram a week ago. The story is worthy of the known inventive powers of the historian Thiers, good for rousing the Breton and Vendean peasantry, but not believed even by a Tribune editor.

‡ One million francs, having already pillaged and taken all they could lay their hands on; and the priests, too, all in prison! An outrageous demand! These be "desperate" and "fierce excesses," in good sooth. And at midnight!



APRIL 12. The curé of the Church of Madeleine is reported to have been assassinated by a Parisian mob.

APRIL 13. The delegates proposing conciliation return. M. Thiers issues another circular calling them Communists and assassins. Resignations from the Commune continue.

APRIL 14. *The Communists* \* are plundering the public offices of their papers and their plate.† The latter is sent to the mint. The churches are carefully searched,‡ and all valuables seized to be converted into coin. Notwithstanding all *Communist* precautions, five hundred thousand people have left since the troubles began.§

APRIL 16. The state carriages of Prince Murat and Marshal Canrobert have been seized by the Commune officials. A delegate of the Commune has taken an inventory of the objects of value in the most fashionable churches.|| The Central Committee are still at variance with the Commune.¶

APRIL 20. A Commune manifesto says, *Paris does not aim at dictatorship. She desires the decentralized unity of the country.* "The London Telegraph" says, The Arc de Triomphe has been destroyed by the fire of the Versaillists. The "Mot d'Ordre" condemns the Commune for its suppression of various journals.

APRIL 21. Another revolution is imminent. The Commune has arrested the Central Committee. Complete anarchy reigns.

APRIL 23. Last evening the cash-box of the Parisian Gas

\* Notice how adroitly the ingenuous editor changes the *Communal Council* to *the Communists*. "For ways that are dark," &c.

† Their "plate." What plate in public offices?

‡ To be sure that nothing was left by the first pillagers.

§ The troubles began on the 18th of March, twenty-five days ago. An exodus of twenty thousand persons daily, notwithstanding *Communist precautions*. It was one hundred and sixty thousand in ten weeks, before. It is well to certify the exactness of our correspondents.

|| The churches are pillaged on the 7th. On the 14th they carefully search them, and seize the remaining valuables. On the 16th they make an inventory of what is left. These *are* pillagers. And beside the treble pillage of the churches, having, let us say, gutted one house, they do seize two state carriages. A most *Communistic* and pillaging *Communal Council*, forsooth!

¶ Or *Communal Council*? The editor keeps the words well mixed, for the more confusion.

Company was opened by National Guards, and seven thousand francs abstracted. The money has been returned to the Gas Company. The Montmartre battalions are mutinous. A delegation of Freemasons has gone to Versailles to ask an armistice, to allow the inhabitants of the bombarded villages to leave.

APRIL 24. Thiers refuses the armistice. The Commune apologizes to the Gas Company. The churches of St. Roch and St. Sulpice have been reopened, and their curés released from imprisonment.

APRIL 25. Gen. Cluseret and the Central Committee are quarreling. Thiers admitted to the Freemasons his intention to bombard Paris as soon as he had all the forts. He consents to an armistice without recognizing the Commune. A placard on the walls of Paris invites "friends of order" to be in readiness to avenge their brethren murdered in the recent butchery in the Place Vendome.\*

APRIL 30. A Masonic procession, half a mile in length, passed through the streets to-day, and planted their banners on the ramparts under a heavy fire. *All the Paris lodges were represented.* At a sitting of the Commune, M. Grousset repelled the charge of reproachable warfare. *The use of explosive bullets and the bombarding of women and children was confined to the Versaillists.* In the cartridge-boxes of prisoners explosive bullets had been found, and the wanton shelling of the most crowded parts of the city had been going on for weeks.

MAY 2. The Commune has appointed a Committee of Public Safety.

MAY 3. The Column in the Place Vendome and all statues and vestiges of monarchy are to be destroyed.†

\* See the first note on page eighty-five.

† "The Commune of Paris —

"Considering that the imperial column on the Place Vendome is a monument of barbarism, a symbol of brute force and false glory, an affirmation of militaryism, a denial of international right, a permanent insult from the conquerors to the conquered, a perpetual criminal attempt [attentat] against one of the three great principles of the French Republic, Fraternity —

"Decrees, —

"*One single Article:* The Column of the Place Vendome shall be demolished.

"PARIS, April 12, 1871."

MAY 7. Five priests arrested on the charge of being spies. The church of St. Eustache converted into a political club-room; that of "St. German l'Auperrois" used for public meetings and concerts; and the Tuileries as an asylum for the widows and orphans of National Guards killed in the struggle. A decree orders the restoration of pledges under the value of five francs.

MAY 8. A concert at the Tuileries in aid of the wounded: twelve thousand francs collected.

MAY 10. The "Sub-committee of Organization," in a proclamation issued to-day, orders the troops not to cease firing on the *Versaillists who may attempt to surrender*; while fugitives and stragglers are to be sabred when caught, or, if in numerous bodies, fired into mercilessly with cannon and mitrailleuses.\*

MAY 11. The demolition decreed of the house of M. Thiers, in consequence of his proclamation.

MAY 16. The Vendome Column thrown down.

MAY 19. A "*Court of Impeachment*" opened to-day to select hostages on whom to retaliate. *Many eminent citizens daily imprisoned.*† The sacred articles in the Church of the Trinity seized. All the churches to be similarly dealt with,‡ and then closed. The demolition of the Chapel of the Expiation§ begun.

MAY 24. Paris in flames. The Louvre completely gutted. Fires raging in nearly every street. The Versaillists fiercely bombarding. The dead unburied. The wounded lying untended in the streets.

MAY 25. Archbishop Darboy, ten hostages, and nearly fifty priests, murdered in cold blood at the Mazas Prison on Tuesday night. || The fires are nearly all extinguished. It is believed that in many cases they were caused by the shells of the Ver-

\* I have not found elsewhere any mention either of the Committee or the proclamation.

† These eminent citizens not having escaped among the five hundred thousand who fled from Paris.

‡ What! pillaging them yet again?

§ Erected in memory of the martyred Louis XVI. Not yet demolished.

|| This is the first account given. Probably the exact number will never be known, nor by whose order they perished. The "cold blood" is remarkable.

saillists, and not by the Communists. Last night and to-day the Government troops refused to give quarter, and killed all who fell into their hands. *THE INSURGENTS are dealing destruction and death.* *THE VERSAILLISTS* "are not savage, but exhibit a childish delight."

MAY 28. It is calculated that there are upward of fifty thousand dead bodies in the houses and cellars of Paris, many of women and children. Since Sunday\* thirty thousand prisoners have been taken, "including numbers of debauched and foul-mouthed women."

So far I have taken the story of the Paris Commune from an enemy's pen. I have suppressed nothing, softened nothing, extenuated nothing, excused nothing, explained only where the explanation was beyond doubt, contradicted only with fair authority. Such tales as eating a chasseur's horse and scourging the naked Archbishop may be left with the "deaths" of men still alive, — uncommented upon. Other statements I leave unnoticed, not recognizing their truth, but being without present means for refuting or verifying them: often finding no mention of them save in the correspondence of "The Tribune." Let the story, with the exceptions noted, stand in "The Tribune" words, with some amount of mendacity still unaccounted for. Even so the accuser can find no warrant for "The Tribune's" foul-mouthed editorials. Where is the ground for the slanders of MM. Thiers and Favre, and all that pack of unprincipled "journalists" which has followed yelping at their heels? Two hundred thousand National Guards are neither pillagers nor assassins. The leaders of these "pillagers" gave themselves *less than seventeen dollars a week* as governors of Paris, and left exact accounts of all the monies which they *pillaged*. Save that one massacre (if you will) of "the hostages," an act of desperation which is not brought home to the Communal Council (and how many were not harmed? we are told that "the prisons were crowded"), no deed of blood disgraced the Parisians. In this "City of Assassins," during two months, up to the 4th of April, only one murder was committed in Paris,

\* The report is dated Sunday ("May 28").

that for the sake of theft, *by one of Thiers' Breton Mobiles*. Under this "Reign of Terror," to the same date, until Paris was actually besieged, while M. Thiers was writing to the Prefects that "the Commune is pillaging," "held in horror by the Parisians, who wait impatiently for the moment of their deliverance," people went to and fro, in and out of the city, and appeals were made to citizens not to keep more than one musket while their fellow-citizens were unarmed. Where was the assassination? The slain and condemned men are yet alive. And the pillage is — THE LIE OF THE HISTORICAL LIAR, THIERS, re-uttered by a knavish fool in "The Tribune," who tells us that they inventoried the church valuables after the churches had been stripped, and refutes his own calumnies by inadvertently holding up the Communal Council of Paris as an example to New York.\* Pillage! They did not even pillage the house of M. Thiers. They destroyed the Vendôme Column, — not without giving reasons. Thiers did not spare the Arc de Triomphe. They fired public buildings, — by the right of war. "It is believed," says "The Tribune," "that in many cases the fires were caused by the shells of the Versaillists, and not by the Communists." By "the Communists," — it was the right of war. Were stone and mortar to be held more sacred than the lives of women and of children? If they fought with the fury of desperation, they were not brutal and cruel as their assailants were. On Thiers' head be the infamy — Napoleon out-Napoleoned — of raising an ignorantly fanatical army † to

\* The Paris Commune was one of the worst bodies that ever cursed a nation or a city. But before its inglorious term of power closed it explained in detail how it acquired five million dollars, and how it expended that sum during two months of its government. Our rulers for two years have not accounted for the money they received, nor explained how it was disbursed. — *Tribune Editor*, May 29.

† The returned Papal Zouaves, Cathelineau's Vendéans, Charrette's Chouans, Trochu's Bretons: the scum of all the ignorance and bigotry of the rural districts. The character of these levies may be inferred from one single fact: that *the Italian Government* remonstrated, seeing in the very existence of such a force a threat of new intermeddling with Rome. To these were joined the Imperial Guards, the picked tools of Napoleon. So was constituted the Army of the Party of Order, under the Imperialist General, MacMahon.

repeat in the name of "order" the outrages and excesses of the League. No such unpatriotic disgrace can slur the sorrowful epitaph of the Paris Commune.

Were they Communists? A Communist has the right to put his belief into action. Was the International Association at its head or at its back? It matters little. The old Communist theories, though still perhaps held by a few individuals, have never moved the masses; are not, since 1849, the dominant theories of even a sect in France. The International Association I cannot track either as instigator or abettor. Members of that wide-spread Association (whose worst reproach is its peacefulness) were among them. It could not be otherwise when the Communal party embraced not merely a knot of political enthusiasts, but the whole working population of Paris, including also the smaller shopkeepers, — the whole of that class which lives by its own labor instead of by the exploitation of the labor of others. It was not only a revolt of Paris against an usurping Assembly: *it was a revolt of labor against the age-long unscrupulous rapacity of power.* For this, well understood by the party of Thiers and "order," it was so ruthlessly crushed out — if the massacre of only fifty thousand men, women, and children has crushed it out. Here is but the beginning.

#### HOW THE COMMUNAL MOVEMENT BEGAN, AND WHAT IT SOUGHT.

It dates from Napoleon's capitulation at Sedan: when men thought they saw in the establishment of the Commune the only force which could resist the Prussians. Favre, Trochu, and others were proclaiming the impossibility of defense; the defeated generals, to lessen their own shame, echoing the cry. Less cowardly, the Parisians, with yet some faith in the love of country, demanded the continuance of the war. The Committee of Defense, aware of the feeling against them, attempted, as governments always do, to hinder the expression of public opinion. This burst out, however, on the 20th of September, in a manifesto, then first published, which demanded, —

1. The suppression of the imperial police, or rather its transfer into the hands of the municipality.
2. Equal subsistence accorded to all citizens and their fami-

lies during the siege, and after the siege the abolition of misery by some social organization of production.

3. The levy *en masse* of all citizens, and forced requisition of whatever could be useful to the defense.

4. Suppression, after the war, of standing armies, and organization of the national militia.

5. The absolute sovereignty of the Commune in all regarding its taxation, police, education, and legislation.

This programme, identical with that proclaimed at the Hotel de Ville on March 18, could not suit the representatives of the principle of authority. It was discussed and combated by them; but, as it gained popularity, they precipitated events, so that on the 31st of October an attempted Communal manifestation was put down by the troops of the line and by the peasant mobiles brought by Trochu to defend the altar and the throne. Nevertheless, this manifestation proved the people's desire to defend themselves; and from this day the Government was forced to allow them to arm, refused before on the ground that there were not arms enough. Paris from that time became an immense war-factory: cannon were cast, cartridges made, old muskets altered. At the moment of capitulation Paris was in its best condition for defense. But the Government feared the Prussians less than they feared the armed people.

The capitulation filled Paris with consternation. And when it was learned that the Prussians would make a triumphal entry, the indignant feeling was so general that resistance, even in spite of the Government, was meditated. Two-thirds of the National Guard were of this mind, and Favre had to return to Bismarck to beg a modification of his programme. So some sort of compromise was come to.

During this parley between the National Guards and the Government, the Guards had taken charge of certain cannon which, though not included in the terms of surrender, the Government had carefully left in the way of the Prussians, as if willing to be rid of them. These the National Guards removed to Montmartre, and placed under the watch of all their battalions, turn by turn.

Meanwhile, the first act of the newly elected Assembly, met



at Bordeaux, was to affront Paris by refusing to hear either Garibaldi\* or Victor Hugo. Resenting this, convinced that the Assembly was royalist, and seeing themselves overruled by the rural districts, again the Commune came into men's minds as the fittest remedy. Still it was only an idea. What further provocation was needed was supplied by the decision to hold the Assembly out of Paris, and by the violent intentions of Thiers, — so plainly put forth in his speeches and proclamations, and attempted to be carried out by the night surprise on the 17-18th of March, and the invasion of Paris on the 18th by the Government troops. In face of this bad faith and maladroitness, the men who had taken the initiative against the capitulation reappeared as a Committee of the National Guard,† and appealed to the city to organize their municipal government, — the Paris Commune.

The situation will be sufficiently explained by the following extracts from the Paris Communal journals. "La Commune," No. 2, March 21, says, —

Paris is reproached with sending ready-made governments to the peasants, — and it is the peasants who weigh down Paris with their empire, plebiscitums, and deputies, who may perfectly satisfy their sottishness, but who have on us the effect of an exhumation of another age. We have been long enough at their mercy. They have absolved December the 2d condemned by us, voted for the war which we repulsed, abandoned the country we would have defended, and now they would impose on us a king.

"Le Cri du Peuple," March 25, says, —

The programme of the revolution has been produced: Paris a free city, not separated from France, but not submitted to statesmen whom it pleases the Province to acclaim, to elect, or to suffer; Paris freely governing itself through its Communal Council and civic and corporate organization, voting its own budget, sending its deputies to the National Assembly, — legislative or federal, — contributing its share for the charges of the country, furnishing in case of war a certain contingent of mobile national guards; Paris remaining the industrial, commercial, economic, and intellectual capital, while ceas-

\* He was elected for seven places.

† They were men unknown to politics, obscure men, — their enemies say, — a reproach or a compliment; and their influence appears due only to the popularity of their cause, and the fact of their initiative in the matter of opposing the capitulation. Some days later I find them sustained by a delegation from all the arrondissements of Paris.

ing to be the political capital of France. . . . At once renovative and conservative, in accord with the traditions of France.

Such programmes of course bind no men. In all revolutions and parties there are some who think the programme too far-going, while in the minds of others it goes not far enough. Among the elder politicians, like Blanqui, some dreams of the old Communist utopias might yet linger. But Communism — the having all things in common, abolition of property and family — nowhere appears, either in the words or acts, of *Communal* (not *Communistic*) Paris. Here I speak neither for nor against theories: I am only stating facts. The Communal idea of this last revolution, so far from being a carrying-out of the ideas of the revolutionists of '89 and '48 (Communistic or other), was indeed a retrogression, — an absolute going back to the days before "France" was.

Look into Thierry's "Letters on the History of France." Read there the account of the Communes, in ancient Gaul, yet divided among kings and counts ever warring upon one another, a country without nationality, without unity, without government. Not rising, as in England, by grace of royal charter, but retaining, with certain modifications, the Roman franchises, only availing themselves of royal pretense or alliance against too potent lord or bishop, these municipalities realized all the freedom possible in those days, were indeed cities of refuge for republican thought, fastnesses in which the worker and the trader found some safety from crowned and helmeted ruffianism that strode high-handed over the world.

The enthusiasm of old times communicated itself from place to place, producing revolutions wherever it found a population numerous enough to dare to enter into the struggle with feudal power. The inhabitants of the towns which this political movement had gained met together in the church or market-place, and took oath, upon the holy things, to sustain one another, and thenceforth not to permit that any one of them should be wronged or treated as a serf. It was this oath, this *conjuración* (or swearing together) as it was called in ancient documents, which gave birth to the Commune. All those who were bound together in this manner took thence the name of *sworn men*, or *men in Communion* ("*jurés*" or "*Communiers*"), and for them these new titles comprehended the ideas of duty, fidelity, and reciprocal devotedness, expressed in antiquity by the word "citizen." . . .

In the south of Gaul, where the old Roman cities existed in greater number, and where, farther off from the centre of Germanic invasions and domination, they had kept their population and their riches, the attempts at enfranchisement were, if not more energetic, at least more completely fortunate. It is there only that the enfranchised cities reached the plenitude of that republican existence which was in some sort the ideal to which all the Communes aspired.\*

To this succeeded the establishment of one kingly power, bringing in the principle of centralization, necessary perhaps towards the unity of the nation, but crushing out the republican Communes. The democratic spirit which arose afterwards in opposition to the centralization of royalty was only reactionary, the assertion of anarchical individualism, not republican. Monarchy overthrown, at the close of the eighteenth century, democracy had logically but the choice between free-trade or Communism, — the two egotisms of employer and employed, in either case only the assertion of every individual's right of power, the opposite pole of the individualism of monarchy. '48 and '51 showed us how extremes meet; how, "the Republic" failing through aiming at egotistical *interests* only, the Empire could outbid the Republic in its appeal to the mere rights of the democracy. Empire is but the greediness of one man; and if democracy be only the assemblage of so many greeds, why should they not come to terms? So universal suffrage proclaimed the Emperor. And the republican must take a new departure. If he accept not the higher theory of *duty*, if his Republic be not *the work of all for the good of all*, growing out of an active and even self-sacrificing propagandism for the sake of all humanity, on what ground shall he build? He confines himself to a mere politic "republicanism," which is only self-defense. After the defeat of '51, who shall wonder that men, whose belief had been in schemes only for the material advantage of individuals (only that, however generous and self-sacrificing the advocate), should stand at bay instead of beginning a new pursuit? Who shall blame them if they could not escape the fatality of their own logic? Men who had passed through the Communism of Cabet and the like may be pardoned if, even

\* Thierry, Letter xiii.

in rejecting that, they still retained some little of the separatist spirit of earlier days, confirmed also, it may be, by a natural feeling of reaction against the centralization which has been the curse of modern France, and which helped to throw her so entirely at the feet of the Decembrist. On the other hand, men feeling the insufficiency of merely political change caught perhaps too hastily at any clue to lead them from the labyrinth. I am not criticising the men. I am only recalling certain modes of thought, so endeavoring to find the causes and track the courses of events.

In their exile, after the establishment of the Empire, Pyat and some others appear to have fallen back upon this idea of the older Commune. Recollect the vote, not once only, for the Emperor. Bear in mind the net-work of imperial centralization. What shall break through that? What shall stand against the mightily organized power of the Church, buttressing the Empire? Appeal to the nation, — to the voices of the ignorant peasant majority! Wait the triumph of ideas, — ideas are proscribed, and it is the Church that educates. Exile or the City of Refuge — there seems no other choice. Again the Empire passes, not overthrown, but falling through. There is again a chance. Even this despair shall give us ground. This war against the foreigner shall make a nation of us, and in some sort a republic, with room and time for development and the thought of further progress. And, lo! the peasantry elects a monarchical Assembly that betrays us to the Prussians; the army of the Church will bind us to the wheels of some new constitutional monarchy, — a new Louis Philippe, or Thiers, in place of Napoleon. As a Frenchman, I think I would have given my life unhesitatingly for the Commune. And yet —

Outside of all individual or national difficulties, beyond all that may excuse or justify us as individuals or in the composite individuality of nationhood, stands the inexorable law of cause and effect, which will not spare us for any excuse, for even the most sufficient justification. The days of isolation and separatism are at an end, whether in Convents, Communes, or Communities, whether for Cities of Refuge or for Nations. The walls of China are falling, as those of Arles and Nimes and

Laon fell, not to be built up again. Our business, our hope, is no longer isolation, but association and devotion to humanity. The Christian theory of *Right* is a problem worked out and demonstrated. We have no new phase of it to learn. But we have to learn the new gospel of *Communion*, the *Duty* of fellowship. Not again the hermitage in which the world may be forgotten; not again the Commune of old time, jealously guarding itself from the world, an armed sentinel, as inhumanly if not as tyrannously egotistical as the robber lord or more imperial brigand against whom it then was justified in keeping guard; no longer the narrow national and inhuman policy of "avoiding entangling alliances." The hermit must quit his cell for active citizenship, the Commune labor *for and with and under order of* the nation, the nation own itself a citizen of the world. Each in its sphere, — citizen, Commune, or nation, — only the sworn soldier, or, if need be, martyr, of universal republicanism. This is the duty of the time: and in the misunderstanding of this lay the mistake of the Paris Commune, and the weakness which would have insured its failure, though the Red flag were floating now over the Hotel de Ville, not only in Paris, but in all the Communes of "republican" France.

Again, I am not speaking against the men. Before the men who gave their lives so grandly I bow my head with reverence I would not owe to kings. I would rather be with Delescluse in that bloody Paris gutter than with the Kaiser in his triumphal car. Honor to the defeated Commune! But let even the other cities of France remonstrate with Paris. Why did they not second her endeavor? Not altogether because of the lying circulars of Thiers; not certainly for want of some sympathetic spontaneity. Lyons and Marseilles believed also in the Commune. Toulouse obeyed the impulse of the capital. But why should one Commune move *with* another? A federation of Communes may be a philosopher's dream; but the policy is unsound. If your principle is isolation, separation, the federation is as it pleases us, when it pleases us, or not at all. There lies the fatal error of any sectional policy. We are not going backward to secession and division, even with a federation as the end. The peoples have suffered enough to obtain even the

framework of nationality: suffered all the evils of kingship, obliged, for the sake of one great ruler in an age, to bear the tricks of ordinary monarchs who cut and carved the countries at their caprice, joining this to that without sense of fitness, and often in their wars sundering the little cohesion that wiser men ordained or better times allowed. Still, after much suffering, we are somehow stumbling into the framework of nationality, the first condition for the real organization of society. It is something to have the form. Though the spirit of nationality which shall give us life and growth can only be breathed into us by the Republic.

The Commune is a failure. The men who attempted it are condemned. The great humanitarian question set by these "Communists," the question of the abolition of misery through the organization of labor, is not to be solved that way. Is the Reaction therefore sure? This wager of battle has given no verdict for or against the issue. It says no more than this: Not by a single city, nor by a separate nation, shall that remodeling of society be accomplished through which the hire of the laborer shall no longer be kept back by fraud. The weakness of the Paris Commune lay in its isolation. Yet all that blood has not been poured out in vain. One gain cannot escape us. While we note mistaken policy, let us not the less take this to heart: that once again these men of Paris have given to the world the ever-needed example of heroic daring and devotedness, have laid one more broad stone (though it be their own grave-stone) of that glorious causeway over which Humanity, defeated or triumphant, marches firmly to the Republic.

W. J. LINTON.

## THE NEW PROTESTANTISM: ITS RELATION TO THE OLD.\*

**B**ROTHERS AND FRIENDS: It would be easy and pleasant to bring some subject here which should touch no agitating differences of opinion, but give an opportunity for developing those points of belief—and they are many—wherein we should all be likely to agree. And that kind of reconciling discourse is so consonant to my tastes and feelings, and seems so befitting this occasion of reunion of old friends and of fellow-students and fellow-laborers, that I have tried hard to make it appear consonant with my sense of duty. But I find that I cannot satisfy my own conscience, nor should I, as I believe, satisfy your expectations, were I not to use the occasion to speak of the topics that are to-day nearest my thought and heart,—even though they are topics on which there will probably be more of dissent than agreement. And why should I hesitate? Am I not among those who respect liberty of thought and utterance? Was not yonder Hall, out of which this Association of Alumni, year after year, has come, dedicated to “Free Inquiry” as one of its most prominent objects? And did we not imbibe from the very atmosphere of the place, and from the whole spirit of the professorial instruction, that fidelity to conviction is more worthy than fidelity to creed? And when we come back to greet each other at our annual gatherings here, what is it that we most want to learn from him who is selected to give the formal address, but just what he himself, through the study and experience of his active life of professional duty, has come to see and think? We want him to report the outlook of the field, in some part of which we are all engaged, as it appears to him. If the report agree with what we, or any of us, have seen from our own posts of duty, very well,—we are thereby encouraged and strengthened; but if it differ, just as well, if not better,—for then the effect may be as if our own

\* A Discourse delivered before the Alumni of the Divinity School of Harvard University, June 27, 1871, by William J. Potter.



vision were enlarged, and we discover that the field is wider, its conditions more varied, its agencies more manifold, than at our separate points we had supposed. What we want is neither agreement nor dissent as such, but faithfulness of each reporter to his own observations. And may I not add, what seems to me true from my point of view at least, that the agreement, the bond of fellowship, among the members and friends of this Alumni Association, cannot consist in unity of the reports either as to observations, opinions, or instrumentalities, but must rest on the fact that, while each is free to work according to his own light and in his own way, we are all working essentially for the same general end,—the discovery and promulgation of the highest truth and the promotion of the welfare of humanity. To this end we must, surely, desire to hear what any thoughtful, earnest brother may have to say, indicating what seems to him from his stand-point to be the highest truth and to be promotive of human welfare, however much his view may differ from our own.

In this spirit I come, brothers, with my word to-day ; come, as I feel assured you would have me come, to speak candidly, faithfully, firmly, yet also trustfully and fraternally, of the things which appear in the range of my vision from the outlook to which twelve years' ministerial experience has brought me. And I can best gather, perhaps, what I have to say around this topic,—The New Protestantism : by which I mean the spirit of revolt which has specially manifested itself in Christendom in the last generation, against all the traditional forms of authority in the Christian Church, and which is now beginning to organize itself, in different phases indeed, but evidently with a more definite consciousness of its own character, and of its logical aims and practical capabilities. I choose the word "Protestantism," because, both in its generic meaning and in its special meaning as applied to an era in the ecclesiastical history of Christendom, it very accurately indicates what seems to me the correct view of this present era in religious thought and development of which I am to speak, and which it is the chief purpose of this discourse historically to vindicate. Considering this proposed limit of my argument, my subject might be better defined, perhaps,

as Protestantism, Old and New ; or, the New in its relation to the Old.

Let me begin by pointing out the generic significance of the word "Protestantism." For though Protestantism, as we commonly hear the word in Christendom, has a definite application to a special era and movement in Christian history, in itself it is by no means confined to Christendom, much less to that special era ; but may be found, both in spirit and in form, in all religious history, and marks the conditions of religious development in general. Several of the great existing religions of the world originated directly, so far as we can trace their origin to any outward occasion, in the spirit of Protestantism. And with the origin of all the rest, were not their sources lost in the uncertain wilds of legend, we should probably find that Protestantism had much to do. That is, the steps which led to that concentration and organization of effort which finally resulted in a specific religion began in a protest against some existing form of error. Buddhism began in a protest against the alleged errors and corruptions of Brahmanism. Zoroaster came as a reformer, protesting against the doctrines and practices of some more ancient faith in Persia. Christianity had its outward origin in the protest of Jesus and Paul against the sectarian Pharisaic interpretation of Judaism. Mohammedanism arose from a vigorous protest against trinitarian and other metaphysical corruptions of Christianity.

So, too, if we look within the limits of the specific religions, we shall find that their development historically has been accompanied, from time to time, if not constantly, by the same spirit of protest ; and I believe that we shall find that in those religions which have shown most capacity for development and have made most progress, the spirit of protest has been most active and has met with the largest recognition. It was by no means latent in Judaism before the advent of Christianity. The prophets were its natural exponent and outlet of expression. And it has appeared again in modern Judaism, as the late Hebrew Convention, with its important reformatory measures, in the city of Cincinnati, bears witness. It has shown itself, at intervals in India, in the native Hindu religion, and in the rem-

nants of Parseeism ; to a still less extent, perhaps, in China and in the Mohammedan faith. But in Christianity it has appeared more effectively than in any other faith that has existed in the last two thousand years. It was at the bottom of the division between the Greek and the Latin churches. It manifested especial vigor in the German revolt against the authority of Rome, to which it gave its name. And every sect that has risen in Protestant Christendom has sprung from some new protest against some old form of belief or ceremony or ecclesiastical authority. It was the root of Puritanism, as also again of the Liberal Christianity that called the Puritan creeds in question and won a larger freedom for individual inquiry and opinion.

So much for Protestantism in its generic significance as one of the essential conditions of all religious development and progress. It is sometimes accused as being a spirit of denial merely. But the accusation is unjust ; for every denial that the true protestant spirit makes implies an affirmation that is at least claimed to be larger than the denial. A protest is made, it is true, against some alleged error and falseness ; but the fact that it is made rests upon the claim of the discovery of some truth. That which really makes the protest is not a spirit of sheer denial which lurks in some vacant apartment of human consciousness, but the perception of some new relations of fact or thought, which of itself opposes and displaces the old possessor. When Sakya Muni made his protest against Brahmanism, he certainly affirmed some things that were quite as large as the errors he denounced, and that became the basis of one of the most wonderful religious movements the world has ever known. When Jesus protested against the teachings of the Scribes and Pharisees, for every protest he made an affirmation that more than covered the vacancy that would be made by the removal of the doctrine that was denied. If he called in question the commands by "them of old time," it was that he might put a larger command in its place ; if he protested against the prevailing morality, it was to inculcate a moral law that should run deeper into the heart, and "a righteousness that should exceed the righteousness of Scribes and Pharisees." When Mohammed pro-

tested against certain doctrines and practices of Christianity in Arabia, he made a fresh affirmation, then and there greatly needed, of the purer doctrine of monotheism. When Luther and his coadjutors of the Reformation made their protest against the claims of the Church of Rome, so far from acting in the mere strength of a spirit of denial, they made a most tremendous affirmation,—an affirmation more momentous in its consequences than any that had been heard in Christendom, at least, since the days of Paul,—the affirmation of *the independence of the individual soul*. And so of all protests, large or small, that have had any real vitality and have played any important part in religious history: they have always contained, by implication if not by express declaration, the positive assertion of some truth which will more than fill the place of the alleged error that is denounced. Should this not be so, the protest has little power and soon ceases as a force in history. All movements that have any substantial life, and can endure and propagate themselves, live by their affirmations, and not by their denials. The protest, the denial, the destruction, is simply the breaking of some old shell of custom or belief, and is incidental to the first stage in the process of fresh life; but that power of life which breaks the shell, and soon leaves it behind buried in the ground and forgotten, while itself springs up into the light and air to unfold its symmetry and beauty and mature its fruit, is not the denial, but the affirmation.

But I called this spirit of modern revolt in Christendom against all ecclesiastical standards of authority the New Protestantism, not only because of its likeness to the general protestant spirit which accompanies all historic religious development, but because it is connected by special likeness and kinship to that movement which is technically characterized in Christendom as the Protestant Reformation. There is, indeed, no difficulty in tracing a direct genealogical line between the two. This new Protestantism that has risen in the last generation is the legitimate descendant and heir of that which was born in Germany in the sixteenth century. To this point, though it be nothing new, let me, for the sake of a clear statement, now call your attention.

I have already said that in the protest of Luther and his coadjutors was contained a most momentous affirmation, — that of the independence of private judgment. This, of course, was not the whole of the Protestant declaration as made against the claims of Rome; nor was the affirmation of individual independence made in this bare and absolute form, nor comprehended, probably, at the time in all its consequences. Yet this claim for the rights of private judgment was none the less the active, vital principle of the Protestant movement, — the very gist of the Reformation, — the force within and behind all the other forces that the Reformation set in motion, and the one principle that gave to Protestantism its continuing and self-propagating power and opened for it its great career in history. This was its one grand affirmation, — the only positive thing that Protestantism had of much importance to distinguish it from Romanism. Rome, as well as the Reformers, had the Christ, the Church, the Bible, the Sacraments, all the old beliefs and sacred associations; and the Reformation at the outset made no great change in these, except in the *use* of the Bible, — and that change was dependent on this claim for individual reason. Rome had everything that the Reformers had save this one idea of the rights of private judgment. The protest against the sale of indulgences, against the *abuse* of authority, against the corrupt practices of the papal court, might have been easily parried and silenced, and could never have produced the Protestant movement, had it not been for this one idea, that there was something in the human mind, in the mind of the most humble layman of the church, that had an inherent right to protest against the authority of priest or pope.

This statement is indeed, in this presence at least, a mere truism. I make it, and thus emphatically, simply for the consequences involved in it. Nor, as already hinted, do I mean to affirm that the right of private judgment was declared as an abstract principle, nor that it was conceived at the time to exist without some common verifying standard of truth which was within human reach. Of course, I am well aware that the entire declaration which the Reformers made of their principle included the authority of the Bible. The Bible, they affirmed,

was the standard, absolute and unquestionable, of truth and duty; *but the Bible was to be read and interpreted by every man for himself*,—that they equally affirmed; and that was the really vitalizing element of the declaration. Where Rome said, The Church is the infallible authority, the Reformers said, The Bible,—and that was no very great change; but where Rome said, The Priesthood are the interpreters of the authority, the Reformers said, Each person is his own interpreter,—and that was a difference which was equivalent to revolution and fraught with consequences at which the Reformers themselves might have stood aghast if they had foreseen them. The two parts of their declaration were, in fact, logically at war with each other. The affirmation of the right of private judgment in the interpretation of the authoritative standard was destructive of all claim for the practical infallibility of the standard, unless one was ready to affirm infallibility of the human faculties. No declaration of an infallible authority could stand with this proviso in behalf of individual reason attached. In that proviso was the germ of modern Rationalism, which finds the sole authority for religious truth and duty in individual reason and conscience, enlightened with such helps of culture as are available: modern Rationalism is the old Protestantism in its new phase.

Yet this contradiction in the Protestant principle was not perceived nor felt at the time, and the principle served very well as a popular rallying-cry to unite the various elements of protest and reform in an organized defense against the ecclesiastical claims of Rome. It was not until the Protestant movement began to develop its separate and independent life that the antagonism between the two parts of its declaration appeared, and it became evident which was the stronger and really impelling element of the movement, and what consequences it involved. Then those whose convictions were most enlisted for the first part of the declaration—the authority of the Bible—took alarm and began to bethink them for resources to save the infallibility of the standard against the undermining inquiry which had been set at work by the second part of the declaration. These efforts, so far as they were made directly upon the book itself, aimed to so hedge it around with claims for its inspiration

and authenticity that interpretation should be allowed the smallest latitude possible; and they reached their natural culmination in the doctrine of literal and plenary infallibility, involving the assertion that the Almighty Mind had directed even the punctuation and vowel points and supervised the work of translation, — which doctrine was issued in a decree of a Protestant council at Geneva in 1675, one hundred and thirty years after the death of Luther. This decree was the legitimate result of the first part of the Protestant declaration, the Bible an infallible authority, divorced from the second part, the proviso in favor of private judgment; and not only the legitimate result, but the natural *limit of development* for that part of the Protestant principle. After that there was nothing more that it could do. And from the date of that decree it began to cease as a positive, active force in Protestantism. The doctrine of the decree could not possibly stand against the research and scholarship which the Reformation had set free. It would not now be defended by any scholar of the most orthodox sect, and will soon be remembered only as one of the curiosities of theology.

Another more effective method resorted to by the party that undertook the special defense of the first part of the Protestant declaration against the latitudinarianism that inhered in the second part, was the application of the creed principle. It was claimed that, though individuals were free to read and interpret the Bible each for himself, yet that interpretation was more likely to be correct which was held by the great body of Protestant Christian scholars and believers. And so all candidates for church-fellowship must be compelled to subscribe to certain statements, put into the form of a covenant or creed, which were to be the authorized standard of Scriptural interpretation. This creed principle, accompanied by a liberal use of two very efficient rods of terror, the *odium theologicum* and the threat of ecclesiastical excommunication, has been wielded with great effect, and to no small extent has accomplished the purpose intended. It was really a practical resuscitation within the Protestant Church of an authority corresponding to that of the priesthood in the Church of Rome. It did not go so far, it was not so clearly defined in words; but in substance it was



the same thing, and was just as much a violation of the rights of private judgment, in its new form as in its old. It was, in fact, one of the hereditary relics of the old church. Still, powerful as the creed principle was, it was not strong enough wholly to obstruct and neutralize the new vital force of mental freedom which was really at the centre of the Protestant movement. That force held on its way, having the right of way; not unresisted, unobstructed, but steadily, confidently, persistently, triumphantly overcoming obstructions, and shaping Protestant organizations and society according to its own likeness. It has manifested itself in several forms and directions,—as in the gradual emancipation of science, of literature, of philosophy, of art, of the common education of the people,—and so has developed a vast power, which is largely outside of the proper channel of ecclesiastical organization. But regarding its power in the history of the church, which is here our chief province, it has shown itself there especially in the multiplication of sects. As soon as it was attempted to bind the Protestant Church together by a creed founded upon an authoritative interpretation of the Bible, the church was split into sects; and the sects, trying to save their beliefs in the same way, by another application of the creed principle, were split up again and again, until it has become almost a hopeless task to count the fragments. The creeds themselves have been liberalized, the tests even in the strictest sects have been moderated; but still the secessions and the splitting of sects and churches have gone on, and must go on so long as it is attempted to set up in a creed the slightest vestige of authority over individual reason. It is the old protest of original Protestantism,—the affirmation of the rights of private judgment. The Roman Catholic is right when he says that the Protestant principle tends to disintegration of the church into churches and sects, and of these fragmentary churches and sects into individuals. It does so; and yet it might not have been so if the principle had not been resisted. So long as the churches and sects make their existence depend upon acceptance of some authoritative standard of belief however slight, so long as they build themselves across the track of this principle of the right of private judgment by laying thereon a

single plank of ecclesiastical authority, they must expect to be thrown off and broken into pieces, even though they should be shivered into the individual atoms of which they were constructed. The principle must keep its track, straight-forward, no matter what churches, creeds, authorities, sacred associations and beliefs stand in its way, until it reaches its logical goal in history. And is it not clear that that logical goal, the legitimate, inevitable, unescapable conclusion of this central Protestant principle, — a conclusion which must be accepted "for better or worse" if you accept the principle, — is just this modern spirit in the religious world which I have defined as the new Protestantism, — which revolts against every form of spiritual authority save that which has its seat in human reason and conscience, and admits no other ultimate attest on earth than that which natural human intelligence itself supplies?

Should there be any doubt remaining on this point, the line of descent may be directly traced by indisputable ecclesiastical genealogy. Let us review, for a moment, the steps by which authority in religion has been gradually discarded in Protestant Christendom. The original Protestantism of the Reformation denied the authority of tradition as embodied in the Romish Church and priesthood. It tried to hold to the authority of the Bible, with the proviso that each man should interpret it for himself. Creeds were established to protect the authority of Scripture, but the proviso was stronger than the creeds, and called their authority in question. Sects were successively formed, claiming under the right of private interpretation more freedom than was allowed by the creeds. So came the Puritans, the Independents, the Baptists, the Methodists, each developing the right of private judgment a little further. Fox and the Quakers made a still larger claim, — namely, that the same spirit that dictated the Bible still visited the human soul, furnishing an inner light equal in authority to the written revelation; and Swedenborg, that within the literal revelation was hidden another, for reading which a new illumination had been vouchsafed. And thus, with the authority of creeds and of the Bible itself a good deal damaged, came in due course the era of Liberal Christianity, — the era of those sects that made a new

claim for free thought, and urged that a true interpretation of the Bible would overthrow all the essential dogmas of the usual Protestant creeds. These sects may be said to have discarded the authority of creeds as interpreters of the Bible, and to have gone back to the simple declaration that the Bible itself was the creed and human reason and scholarship its interpreter; with this advantage over the original declaration of the same principle, that human knowledge, and Biblical scholarship in particular, were three hundred years farther along than when the Protestant Reformation began. It soon became evident to the scholars of these sects, especially to those known as Unitarians, that the authority of the Bible as a whole could not stand. It was divided against itself; it was in many things antagonistic to science; it did not always harmonize with common sense; the claims that were made for its miraculous inspiration were not substantiated by critical investigation: and so gradually the authority of the Bible was abandoned,—first of Genesis and the Pentateuch; then the Prophets were rationalized away; and then the protesting spirit crept over into the New Testament: it pared away the ante-natal chapters concerning Jesus from Matthew and Luke, detected a dogmatic tendency to be allowed for in John, discovered interpolations and editorial coloring corrupting other parts of the Gospels, doubted strongly the genuineness of the epistle to the Hebrews as a work of Paul, and had some question of Timothy and Titus, and still more of the Apocalypse, whose inspiration, at any rate, was to be rated very low. This has been especially the process in the Unitarian line of Liberal Christendom; and the process has ultimately in that denomination in practically discarding the Bible as authority, save so far as it accords with the teachings of reason, science, and intuitive perceptions of ethical and spiritual truth.

A partial exception, however, must be made to this statement,—an exception, too, which, though but partial, is one of great moment, since it is the exception which prevents the Unitarians from carrying the Protestant principle to its logical ultimate. Unitarians allow rational and critical scholarship to work freely with the Bible,—they do not insist that you shall believe

in the Old Testament as authority at all; they will allow the infallibility of Paul and Peter to be doubted; they make no claim for the literal authenticity of the Gospels; they do not even insist that the miracles of the Gospels shall be believed: but they do claim that out of the Evangelical records, after rational and scholarly criticism has sifted them to the utmost, there appears in clear relief the distinct historic person of Jesus, and that in his teachings, character, life, is a specific authoritative revelation of Christian truth and duty. They do not ask for unity of definition as to the nature of this person; he may be believed to be the pre-existent, miraculous Son of God, a supernaturally endowed man, or a man of simply human faculties raised to great perfection: but, whatever his nature, he must be believed to be, in some exceptional sense, an authority,—one whose word must be taken as invariably true, whose act as invariably right, and whose spirit has either naturally or supernaturally so passed as a vital religious force into history that he is the rightful Head of the human race.

I am speaking to those who, of course, will understand that I do not presume to suppose that all who are of the Unitarian denomination would be content with this statement concerning the authority of Jesus or of the Bible. I know, as you know, between what wide extremes Unitarian opinions float. But it is, as it seems to me, a fair statement of the principle of spiritual authority as it is now recognized by Unitarianism, so far as Unitarianism is *denominationally* organized. The National Conference of Unitarian Churches is satisfied with a general confession of allegiance to Jesus or his Gospel (leaving it, perhaps designedly, a little uncertain which), and invites to its fellowship all who wish to be his followers. "The confession of Christ," without asking just what the confession means, or how much it includes, or how it was arrived at,—leaving full and free latitude in that respect,—may be truthfully said to represent the present attitude of Unitarianism with regard to authority in religion. As James Martineau expressed it some years ago, in spite of the errors and defects of the record, the life and character of Jesus may be claimed to stand forth as the sublimest conception of humanity, "the perfect moral image of God and

the perfect model for man." And this indefinite confession of allegiance to Jesus as the religious leader of the human race, is the last refuge of the principle of authority in Protestant Christianity.

But is it possible to stay in this refuge and at the same time keep terms with reason? To my mind it is plainly impossible. Protestantism took on board, three and a half centuries ago, the pilot of free thought. There have been various landing-places along the voyage, and the passengers have been continually getting off: the voyage was growing longer than they expected, or they began to distrust the pilot, or they became tired of journeying and longed for repose,—for one reason and another they have stopped; and at each stopping-place the multitude that have landed have been fain to believe that that spot was the real end of the voyage and just the best spot on the whole route to live in! It was just far enough towards the sea to feel the fresh, cool breezes from thence, and just far enough inland to be safe from ocean storms, and to keep connection with the old country and neighbors that had been left behind. But the pilot and the ship have kept on; and those who would see the voyage through must keep on board. The journey does not end at the point where the Unitarians have landed and pitched their tent. They seem a goodly company, their tent is roomy, their fellowship is of the best, their location both airy and sunny, their aspect cheerful, their zeal not over-burdensome; but that is not the destined goal of the Protestant journey. There is at least one stage beyond. Figure aside, the Protestant movement has not developed to its full logical conclusion until reason has been emancipated absolutely from every form and semblance of external spiritual authority, and the authority of Jesus, like that of the church, the priesthood, the Bible, the creed, shall be subjected to the authority of the natural reason and conscience. This step is a logical and historical necessity. Unitarianism especially, having laid such emphasis on the duty of free inquiry and free scholarship, and having gone so near to the logical end, is bound to take this final step. Those who have taken it already, and they are many, are the legitimate children of the Unitarian movement; they have been nursed at

the breasts of its thought; they have been bred on its culture; they are bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh. Theodore Parker took the step, and he was the legitimate successor of Channing and Norton, though Unitarianism in America disowned him. Others have since gone farther than Parker with regard to the Christian name, but they stand in the same direct line of inheritance, connected back through Parker and Channing and Wesley and Robinson and Fox to the pure Protestant blood of Luther and Zuinglius; and when Unitarianism or Protestantism casts them off, they cast off their own children.

Particularly, when I read the sublime pleas of Channing for the fullest liberty of inquiry, and for the formation of religious opinions untrammelled by the authority of great names or of ecclesiastical organizations, and when I remember his earnest protestations against imposing upon the convictions of a single soul the bondage of a creed or making articles of faith the test of religion, I am compelled to ask whether those who call themselves "Channing Unitarians," because, perchance, they adopt his theological belief, are, in reality, so truly his followers as are those who, entering into his labors and adopting his methods of fearless inquiry and criticism, have taken up the results of his thought, and advanced to still clearer visions of truth and to still greater victories over the degrading errors of the popular theology. It behooves us at least to inquire whether to *stand* where Channing stood a generation and a half ago is to be his *follower*. None, I am sure, quicker than he, would rebuke the attempt to build a sect upon his beliefs by cutting off all inquiry beyond. To stop at his results, as though all truth were found, is not to honor, but to defame his memory. The only church that can be an honest monument to his name, and truly claim him as one of its chief apostles, is that which, with the largest liberty of mental inquiry and unlimited progress in spiritual truth, combines the utmost charity to opponents in opinion and brotherly love to all men. He had, I well know, definite theological convictions, which were undoubtedly dear to him, and which he vigorously defended. But what gave him his high place in ecclesiastical history, and is most central and abiding in his influence in the world to-day, is not his theology, — which in truth

has a very small following, — but his emancipated thought and spirit.

There are those, however, who argue that it is possible to keep both the authority of the Christ and the authority of reason. They are earnest, sincere, able, and their argument is to be courteously met. They believe that in what they call "Christian liberty" the destined goal of Protestantism is reached, and that all passing beyond is mere individual vagary and full of peril. Christianity, they say, rightly understood, *is* spiritual liberty. In reply to this argument, I would say that the phrase "Christian liberty" is ambiguous, and hence a fallacy lurks in the reasoning. With reference to the established beliefs and ceremonies of his time Jesus certainly preached a gospel of emancipation. He did not, it is probable, grasp the idea of spiritual liberty in its abstract, logical completeness; yet his mission in the main was a new manifestation of the old universal right of human nature to protest against existing ecclesiastical authority. With reference to Judaism, nascent Christianity, under the preaching of Jesus and Paul, was liberty; and both of these teachers sometimes touched the elements of universal spiritual freedom, — as when Paul spoke of "The glorious liberty of the children of God," and Jesus said, "Who made me a judge or divider over you? Why judge ye not of yourselves what is right?" Now if the phrase "Christian liberty" be used in the sense of such teaching, especially of the last passage, it has, of course, a meaning which the freest reason would accept. But this kind of liberty is not the peculiar possession of Christianity. Other great religious teachers and reformers have proclaimed the same. It belongs to those elements of Christianity that are universal; and there is no more reason for giving it the specific name "Christian," than for calling it "Socratic" or "Buddhistic" liberty. It is in reality *human* liberty; and when the words "Christian liberty" are thus interpreted, the adjective logically falls away from the noun, and, in course of time, would practically drop off. But the term "Christian liberty" has another sense much more common and more exact. It means the liberty allowed within a certain enclosure where Jesus is recognized as authoritative Head, — a kind of spiritual liberty which,



it is claimed, no one besides Jesus and his church effectually teaches. The enclosure may be large, the range of opinion and sympathy within it wide, and those who are there may not be conscious of any restraint, feeling no desire or need to go beyond. But suppose that one, interpreting "Christian liberty" in the sense previously spoken of, — as allowing each person to judge for himself what is right and true, — should come to call in question this authoritative headship of Jesus, should be compelled by his reason to deny that Christianity, even in its primitive form, was in any special sense the fountain of universal spiritual liberty, what then? It is evident that such a person would not be free to take that step and at the same time remain there within that enclosure, since he would be denying the fundamental law of the enclosure, which is that Jesus *is* the authoritative Head, the special source and fountain of spiritual truth for the human race. All the freedom that could or would be allowed him, under the definition of "Christian liberty" we are now considering, would be to take the step and depart — perhaps in peace, perhaps not. He must, at any rate, go "beyond the lines" that separate the "Christian" army from all other camps of the religious world. He would not be permitted to pass to and fro, in and out, at his pleasure, nor could there be any free fellowship with him across the lines. In this sense "Christian liberty," then, is clearly a limited liberty. As one of the most rationalistic of the Unitarian writers says, "The Christian confession is its boundary line." We find, therefore, that the term "Christian liberty" has, in popular use, a double meaning, and the two meanings are antagonistic to each other. If, as is sometimes the case, it be used to denote mental and spiritual liberty, pure, absolute, and universal, then there is no logical propriety in calling it "*Christian*." If, on the other hand, the word "Christian" be retained, and a special significance claimed for it which makes its retention necessary, then the liberty is not perfect, is not universal. Yet these two meanings so run into each other, in the common thought of Christendom, that passage from one to the other is an easy and convenient resort in theological argument. The passage, no doubt, is generally made unconsciously, but it none the less involves the fallacy which logicians call an "equivocal middle term."

But it seems incredible to some minds that the authority of Jesus should be called in question. Their reason, they say, accepts his authority; and they proceed to give a definition of authority that shall make the theory rational. They say, Just as Plato and Kant and Bacon are recognized as authorities in philosophy, or Beethoven in music, or Raphael in painting, or Darwin and Huxley in science, so, without anything supernatural in the claim, is Jesus, from his clear spiritual perception, and from the harmony of his life with divine laws, an authority in religious truth. First, I always wish to ask this class of reasoners, Do you mean exactly that? If so, we agree. For that is precisely what free reason might say of the kind of authority possessed by Jesus. But on the ground of this definition it asks that the same kind of authority be recognized also in Zoroaster and Socrates and Sakya Muni, and many another of the world's great teachers. If it be replied, as at this point it usually is replied, "Yes, the same *kind*; but in Jesus it was raised to the absolute and perfect *degree*," I ask again, How do you know that? Remember that on this theory you are trying to substantiate the authority of Jesus without any resort to supernaturalism. You say that he was simply man, and yet by natural ways, through that same quality of character which is possessed to some extent by all wise and gifted human souls, he rose to the position of perfect authoritative spiritual Head of the human race; and you profess to have come to the perception of this by your simple, unaided reason. I ask, therefore, by what faculty of your reason, — which of course you admit to be finite, — by what possible operation of your mind, you, a finite, fallible human being, are able to determine that Jesus, in his character and teachings, set a standard of absolute perfection sufficient for all human needs for all time and never to be surpassed? If you have that power of measurement, you certainly have no need of the standard. If it be said that the same objection would apply to our notion of the absolute perfection of Supreme Being, I reply, No; for we arrive at that conception by a process of *a priori* reasoning. It is simply affirmed that in Infinite Being there must be absolute perfection, without any one presuming to measure or define it. But in this reasoning about

Jesus it is professed that the judgment that he was spiritually complete and perfect is reached *a posteriori*; in other words, by a study of his character and teachings, and by a rational comparison of them with — what? Necessarily, with some ideal in our own consciousness. If you say, finding the position of his absolute perfection untenable on the ground of a purely rational interpretation of his history, that you will not pretend to decide as to that, but are content that he should be recognized as an authority, only very much higher than all others, then, I answer, you have really put his authority on the same basis as that of other moral and religious teachers, and have emptied the word of all its special ecclesiastical significance. On this basis you cannot consistently assume perfection of him, and you accept him as authority only so far as his teachings and spirit are authenticated as true in your own consciousness; and you must be ready to allow that reason may be able to detect defects in him both of doctrine and character.

If, still again, it be attempted to rest the authority of Jesus within the limits of Christendom on the mere fact of the historical connection of the Christian Church with him, and of its natural reception of spiritual life from the pervasive influence of his life and spirit, — again it must be answered that this is a principle which makes his authority in substance the same as that of any other eminent religious teacher. So the Parsee is connected with Zoroaster, the Chinaman with Confucius, the Mussulman with Mohammed; and you have no right on this ground to ask them to transfer their allegiance from their present prophets to Jesus. If we are "Christians" only in the sense that we are connected by ecclesiastical genealogy with that religious movement of which Jesus is the reputed Head, — "Christians" only by the incident of birth, as politically we may be "Americans" or "Frenchmen," — then there is no sense in claiming that the title covers any kind of authority that is not found in other religions, or that it gives us any special and exclusive prerogative upon the revelations of Heaven. We may think the Christian religion the best that has appeared, just as we may think the United States Government the best of existing governments, and yet not believe that either the religion

or the government is perfect, or that the religion more than the government presents a standard of truth and duty that is not subject to the mental and moral intelligence of mankind to-day.

And thus, whatever be the process of reasoning that is chosen for reducing the authority of Jesus to a statement that shall make it purely natural and rational, his authority is thereby put on such grounds that there is no reason for distinguishing it from that of other instructors and benefactors of mankind. In fact, when we have put Jesus in the line of natural humanity, we have really disrobed him of the ecclesiastical vesture of authority, and left him only that kind of authority that is the natural product of every true, courageous, and intelligent life. We actually have taken, though perhaps unconsciously, the last *logical* step in Protestantism, and these nervous efforts to see Jesus in the old ecclesiastical position from the new rational standpoint are but vain clutchings to hold a vanishing tradition. When people in a Christian convention can only "resolve" that they believe Jesus to be the greatest religious teacher and the best man that has ever lived (the purport of a resolution recently introduced in a Western convention), the "Christian confession," as it seems to me, has been stretched by rationalistic interpretation to the last point which it can bear and survive. And when it comes to that, I can but think that a truly reverent and decent regard for the ancient faith included under the words would suggest silence or even denial rather than this feeble masquerading of allegiance. Why not go on and declare Socrates or Zoroaster the next best man, and so on, until we have the whole hierarchy of prophets, after the manner of Comte, and exactly graded according to their merits? No! let us have done with the phrases of authority when we have done with the thing. Let us honor them all, — all these great teachers and helpers of humanity, — making no invidious comparisons, as if we could not derive benefit from them without first weighing them against each other in our mental balances, but getting from each whatever good he offers, and rejecting what is obsolete or erroneous, without feeling troubled in mind lest the moral universe is to be disturbed, if we find it even in the best.

This final step, then, away from the special authority of Jesus must be taken, if we follow the logical line of the Protestant movement in Christendom. And when this step is taken we are in the New Protestantism. The old Protestant principle of free thought in religion, as opposed to external standards of authority, has pressed through, against all obstructions, to its triumph. It has reached its destined logical goal. It has come to consciousness of its own import. It has shown the impossibility of reconciling the freedom of reason with any fixed authoritative revelation, and finds the only representative of authority that man is under obligation to follow in the human faculties themselves. Abandoning all thought of an infallible standard within the compass of human comprehension, it rests simply, yet confidently, on the trustworthiness of human intelligence; or, in other words, on the natural allegiance of human consciousness to the law of truth and right.

And this fundamental principle of Protestantism having logically completed itself, religious history in Christendom is ready for a new departure. The principle thus far has been chiefly employed in resisting opposing principles, in removing obstructions, in clearing the range of its own vision, in making for itself a free opportunity and course. That course and opportunity obtained, having now a clear vision of its path, it will proceed to unfold its positive contents and reveal its significance and power as a constructive force in human society. In this respect there will be found a vast difference between the rationalism of this new era and that denial of the authority of Christianity which took the name of "Deism" and "Infidelity" a century ago. Those were sporadic growths of the Protestant spirit, having no close genetical connection with its historical development. But the rationalism of this era can be traced, as we have seen, by strict genealogical descent *within ecclesiastical lines*, back to the original Protestant principle of the German Reformation. The rationalism of this era, the new Protestantism, is the legitimate child and heir of the Protestant Christian Church itself. It wears henceforth, by right of lawful birth, the escutcheon of the Protestant principle; and ultimately all the spiritual wealth and power of the Protestant

Church that are transmissible and durable must pass into its possession.

If it be asked, What signs does this new Protestantism give of having positive contents? whence is its constructive power to appear? what are its affirmations? I would answer, by way of hint merely, First of all is its grand and central affirmation (the logical consequence of the original Protestant declaration) of the trustworthiness of the human faculties and their natural adequacy for all human experiences, past or present or to come. And to this may be added the affirmation of the trustworthiness of all actual knowledge of the universe, obtained through our faculties, whether on the side of matter or of spirit; the affirmation of the acceptance of the universe, in its totality of material and mental (or spiritual) phenomena, as the revelation to man of whatever Power is above man; the affirmation that all truth must be safe and beneficent; the affirmation that this acceptance of the phenomena of the universe implies the acceptance of the history and experience of man himself, in all the phases of his career, as among the phenomena which the present intelligence of man is always to study; the affirmation that the historic religions are all natural growths of the human soul, under its varied conditions of existence and development, and have, therefore, a common root and natural unity; the affirmation that every human soul has inherent worth and dignity as a representative of mental and moral intelligence, and as an active, living agent in the development of mental and moral intelligence in the universe; the affirmation that every human soul has a natural right to free development, unlimited by any power save the laws that inhere in the natural conditions of existence and that belong to thought itself; the affirmation that all honest thought is worthy of respect, and that men may come together, to confer with each other on the highest problems that concern humanity and to work for common ends of human welfare, on the ground of perfect freedom of individual thought and perfect equality as to all mental and spiritual rights; the affirmation, in short, of fellowship on the basis of freedom, carrying the hope of a practical brotherhood of humanity, in which race is to help race, and na-

tion help nation, and all classes of people, remaining true to their own special thought and work, shall help each other in the onward and upward way that opens continually into the life of Infinite Truth and Right and Beauty.

Let me say again that this record of positive affirmations is only for suggestion; that it is not professed that it is complete or that it might not be amended. The important thing to note is, that the affirmations of this new phase of Protestantism are concerning means and methods, and that they do not contain any statement of belief or opinion that is to be regarded as a finality in the history of thought. Beliefs and opinions will most certainly be reached by these methods and principles, and may be held with tenacity and defended with vigor; but they cannot on these principles be imposed as creeds for the acceptance of other persons, nor be permitted to determine the lines of fellowship.

The apprehension, then, that modern rationalism leads only to barren negation, is a great misconception of its character. There are persons who seem to think that when this final step is taken that breaks the last connection with the ecclesiastical principle of authority, and establishes the complete freedom of reason, there is nothing beyond,—that that is not only the end of Protestantism, but the end of faith, the end of religion, the end of moral and social order, and therefore might as well be the end of the world. Never was there a greater delusion. Nothing beyond? Why, friends, the Infinite is beyond,—the Infinite with all its vast stores of truth and goodness yet to be discovered. The human mind will then have just got rid of its heavy impediments and put itself in light marching order. It will have all its energies free to take up its tools and go to work at its legitimate tasks.

One of our ablest and most honored brothers a few years ago, in a discourse before this body of alumni, in which he took a rather hopeless view of existing religious conditions, spoke of those who were claimed to have gone on in advance of Unitarianism as having simply reached a little eminence to report that there "was no more road in the direction they



had been going." This surely was not the report of such pioneers as Emerson and Parker, but the inference of some timid soldier in the rear, who, not being able to see over the hill to the road as it stretched away on beyond, thought there could be no road there, and that that transcendental line where the little advanced eminence of earth and the sky seemed to meet was the end of all things and the veritable jumping-off-place. I read in an old book, at about the same time, that some two hundred years or more ago, Commissioners were appointed by the Colony of Massachusetts Bay to lay out a road ten miles west of Boston into what was then the wilderness of Newton. The work was arduous: it took, like such works now, more time and money than was expected; and when the Commissioners made their report that the road was complete, they felt obliged to explain these facts to the critical General Court. But they triumphantly added, that, though it had been such a great expense, the Colony was to be congratulated on the successful completion of the work, as there would never be need of a road any farther in that direction! And as I read this old chronicle by the side of our excellent brother's confident opinion that the end of the Protestant road was just in front of the Unitarian camp, I hardly knew which was the more notably, not to say ludicrously, short-sighted of the two. No more road? Let our brothers who are apprehensive of such a catastrophe mount the eminence and see! The ten miles have lengthened into hundreds and thousands. Wilderness after wilderness of doubt has been successfully tracked. Valleys of despair have been exalted; hills that obstructed vision and were difficult of ascent have been made low. Niagara's terrific flood, that seemed the very opening of moral chaos and of the infernal regions, has been safely spanned. Deserts of barren philosophy, and even of sin, that threatened starvation, have been made passable and converted to salubrity. The Rocky Mountains, thick-ribbed with the strength of ancient, long-spent forces, like the church with its old traditions and dogmas, have been surmounted: faith and persistent, courageous labor have literally removed them to prepare the new way of the Lord. And to-day the Protestant

road, following its track of inevitable logic, looks out confidently upon the broad Pacific Sea,—emblem of the Infinite still beyond and above, and a highway also, over whose free and vast expanse the nations and races and religions of the oldest world and the newest are to sail into neighborhood, and into conditions of mutual regard, fraternity, co-operation, progress, peace.

---

#### A DRIFTING SOUL.

**B**ORN of the shadows that it passes through,  
 Incessantly becoming and destroyed,  
 Its form unchanged, its substance ever new,  
 Built from its own largess to the void;  
 Of steady purpose innerly aware,  
 Yet blindly borne upon the streaming air,—

Giving itself away, distributing  
 Its own abundant heart in blessed showers,  
 But not impoverished, since its losses bring  
 Perpetual renewing all the hours:  
 Drifting, sunlit or shadowed, to the sea,  
 O cloud, thou hast a human destiny!

S.

## WHAT THE BIRDS SAY.

WHEN Solomon said, "A bird of the air shall carry the matter," did he know anything about carrier-pigeons, with messages of nations tucked under their wings? Did he know of omens from the flight of birds? Did he know the mimicry of the magpie and parrot, those reporters more accurate than some who write for the daily press; or did he think there was a revelation in these little heralds, whose inspiration, unlike that of human prophets, is mixed with no will of their own? The ravens preached Providence as they fed the prophet from their beaks. The bird on a tree outside the sick girl's window in Portsmouth, Dr. Parker told her, said, "God is still good." Does not every note from the garden or forest or cage say, clearer than the watchman on the walls, "All is well"? O Theologians! you are all wrong about it. This is not a miserable world, wreck of a deluge, valley of tears. All is well: go on working and hoping; you shall be justified in every worthy enterprise. Who ever heard a cock crow in the morning without being inspirited to his heaviest task by that liveliest of all tones uttered on earth, and which seems never to have known what care or grief is, but bears eternal morning in its sound. Do not the nightingale and whippoorwill, as they sing in the dark, teach us our songs should not die in the night of trouble or twilight of uncertainty and doubt? This anthem of the birds is no artificial composition, but immediate echo or continuation of the voice of God. As Jesus told his disciples, so they think not beforehand what in the presence of kings or governors they shall say. They do not, like some performers, wait to be urged. The bobolink sings and flies at once, eagerly darting through the air while the music gushes from his throat, as if he wanted to celebrate the goodness that makes him happy, but says, "I can't quite get it out," — like the great German mystic intoxicated with God.

Almost all the birds are musical. There is a sort of wild sweetness in the caw of the crow, a sound of the pine-barren.

It speaks for solitude, stands for the desert, and yields to the musing mind as singular a pleasure as the sweetest note of the sparrow or lark. Some people like to hear themselves talk; and the crow seems to enjoy the sound he makes, and doubtless disdains the performance of the lark or quail—as the Chinese think their piercing shrieks, with gong and drum, finer than our organs or harps; and when a flock of crows are suddenly disturbed near their nests, their noisy fuss smites the ear like a clash of cymbals. How well I remember them and the odium of the farmers they endured! They pulled up the corn with their bills and had a bounty set on their heads; but I always loved to see their black, glossy feathers and listen to the far-off cries. The scream of the curlew, skimming down the creek, comes into concert as well as the mellow sound of the bird that pronounces so distinctly, "Phebe," or "More wet," or "Here's my beauty, here's my glow." Like the cornet or clarion in the orchestra, adding to the viol and flute, comes the recitation of the robin. The hooting of the owl is not harsh; and when my steps stirred an owl from his noon-tide dozing in his siesta on a stone-wall, he rose to gaze full in my face as if to inquire my business in his haunts: "What doest thou here Elijah?" The twittering of the martins, young and old, as the parents bring their daily rations to the half-fledged creatures, that peep and thrust their little, infantile, bald heads through the holes of their mansionry under the eaves,—how delightful in its gregarious confusion of demands supplied by such numberless dips from the air! Equally so is the set execution of the thrush, that takes its station in the branch of a great tree in the grove, with the airy dignity of any other soloist. The low cluck of the hen, to which the chickens keep time with their triangular or pentangular toes as she calls them to the grain she has just scratched up, or gathers them under her wing, touches the heart as much as the resounding note of the cuckoo, which the Swiss imitate in the peal of the hour on their clocks, or the sound of a human mother as she summons her offspring or hushes them to sleep.

What is the sense of the whole gamut? Goodness and happiness. We ignorantly and presumptuously think it the mere

ignorant figure of praise. I doubt not there is real worship in it, more than in some liturgies. Wordsworth says he must think the periwinkle, trailing its pretty wreaths, has pleasure, and "every flower enjoys the air it breathes;" but do not these winged poets as well as we, who have taken our pens from their pinions, voice the universal joy? "I will awake early," says the Psalmist, but they were up before him. Beginning with the first arrow of light, as if the world were just done, they celebrate the beauty of the workmanship, the fitness of the lodging, the kindness of the owner that lets the rooms to us and them without rent or charge. In man, says Emerson, nature declares her independence. He is the Fourth of July of Astronomy and Zoölogy. But he can learn something from the birds how to keep his grateful jubilee. Lord as he is over the lower tribes, would God have made them so harmonious and handsome merely to be his cruel sport and prey? Yet how many look upon them all, from the eagle to the wren, as but things to be killed whenever they can get near enough with a gun! Is there not something monstrous in the glee of pride at being a good shot? or can we conceive a more contemptible figure than a young man, who ought to be better employed, spending his day, wasting his time as well as his powder, and the nobler ammunition of his mind, in hunting after a dove, making sport of the death of a poor pigeon which has cost him an afternoon, or fetching down a gull, of no merchantable value, with its poor feathers and miserable meat, but counts in the creation alive, soaring sublime in the air, balancing itself, chief of posture-masters, on the gustiest breeze that ever blew, hovering over the deep to mock all its anger, an image of safety to the soul in harder tempests of sorrow, and with its cry intoning, more than all the dash and roar of its own waves, the vastness and majesty of the sea? I know a minister who spent his holiday firing at little birds. It seemed poor business for a messenger of the Dove of the Holy Ghost. Mr. Lincoln said every stroke of the lash might have to be paid for in a drop of blood from the sword. Can we wantonly hurt these fellow-creatures, who are our kith and kin too, without some retribution? Rather bless them for their benefits to us; settle the large score for the list-

less, heavy hours they have enlivened, grudge them not every berry or cherry or plum from the orchard or garden, wilderness or swamp. Could they speak, they would tell us it was their due for value received, that we are down in their books for precious goods imparted and taken on credit. Give them a little bread for their minstrelsy; toll the same flock to your window for crumbs, as some do, every day. The little troubadours will not be overpaid more than were those larger, human ones, that used to travel from door to door of old castles on the Rhine, with their share of the baron's feast. I think better of my sister for feeding the cat. Burke says of a great criminal, "I will not throw him a kitling to torment."

Not only the beasts of the field, the ox and the horse, may be ill treated, but the birds of the air. I admired my worthy parishioner who would not let his neighbor, though one of his best friends, pursue the feathered game he was after with his rifle one inch over the boundary that separated their adjoining estates. But are they not food for man by the primal decree? That direction may turn out more human than divine! But sacrifice their life, if you must, in the most considerate way, as a sober business, not a merry bout.

Among birds most esteemed are the singing birds, which do not give an occasional chirp, but lavish their being in song. Rare specimens of them bring enormous prices, hundreds of dollars, in the market. So the singers among men, David, Homer, Milton, Shakspeare. In common life this is the top of character, to sing to your task, howsoever sore and hard, as Tennyson says the sailor-boy, going to peril, he knows not but death, on the sea, "whistles to the morning star." Yet these singing men are not in very good repute with the orthodoxy which is jealous of all amusement, and rules out the novel, the concert and the play as snares of the devil, like that hard elder brother who in the scripture stood scowling at the door, and, when he heard music and dancing over the prodigal's return, "would not go in"! How many an instrument of pipes or strings has been driven out of church as profane! I knew a congregation split in two by a bass-viol. The unpardonable offense with some of Mr. Dickens is, that he was no melan-

choly exhorter, but gave himself to entertain the world. Gentle master he was of humane morals too, in his wonderful prose drama, without ferule or robe or magisterial chair. He took a light view of evil, say some of his critics. But where do hypocrisy and sensuality more expose themselves than on his page? If he applauded virtue more than he condemned vice, and preached on the precept, "Bark who will at the evil, I will chant the beauty of the good," was he not therefore nearer that light, before which sin flees as a shadow, and to which darkness cannot exist? The birds, that charm us most, after the summer wanes leave their orchestra. You may see the swallows, in the first autumn chills, gather on ridge-poles and telegraph wires and the rigging of ships, preparing to emigrate, some of them half-yearlings who never saw the sunny land they seek. Behold the long lines and wedges cut the sky! We are told of a dog finding his way home through more than two hundred miles of strange territory — the birds find it as many thousands. Is not the matter they carry to convince us we shall find ours? After all, it will not surprise me if the singers have a higher place, at last, than the groaners who have bought up the reserved seats. O Calvinistic judge, O Baptist Boanerges, O little excommunicator of great and good men because your Shibboleth sticks in their throat, beware lest you belittle the Christianity you deny to others and assume to yourself! If not they, but you, are Christians, some may ask, — Of being Christians what is the use? If you are samples and specimens, to be a heathen is better. Washington and Lincoln and Shakspeare not religious men, gone to perdition, and you that rule them out going to glory! the musical souls driven to infernal discord, and the inharmonious elected for the harps! "Can you sing?" is the question if one is a candidate for a choir. 'Tis the same for the oratorio above: Can you sing with your spirit and make melody in your heart? When I could not sing I thought I was lost. My friend, I detect the querulous tone in your voice, with its unmusical accompaniment of the querulous look in your face. You cannot *go* to heaven so, for you are not *in* heaven so. Not only, as Jesus said, behold, but *listen* to the fowls of the air. What a mistake to call it all a blind instinct and no wit! We



say they build their nests after invariable patterns, while man continually alters and improves his house. Not so, answers Mr. Wallace: the birds alter and improve, select the best materials at hand, wool, hair, sticks, clay, — the kingfisher making his nest of the bones of the prey he has devoured. But many men vary not in their architecture. The Arabs with their tents, the Patagonians with their shelter of leaves, the Irish with their turf-cabins, the Highlanders with their stone-shelties, the Egyptian peasant with his mud-cabin, and other tribes with their bamboo and palm-leaf, the Indians and Malays, make little or no change.

No foolish, idiotic song salutes us from the eaves of our dwelling or the boughs of the trees. I looked, said a friend, late at night, at my canary in his cage till I became afraid of him: he overcame my thought; he seemed to have as much right to be as I had. What are we all but a normal school of mutual instruction? How much we can do to train and make happy the lower orders! If we are humble and attentive will they not repay us by becoming teachers and benefactors in turn? For the bird nothing finer has been said than by the poet-banker, Charles Sprague, to two swallows that flew into Chauncy-Place Church during divine service: —

“Gay, guiltless pair,  
What seek ye from the fields of heaven?  
Ye have no need of prayer;  
Ye have no sins to be forgiven.

“Why perch ye here,  
Where mortals to their maker bend?  
Can your pure spirits fear  
The God ye never could offend?”

Perhaps they came to be persuaders to cheerful worship and an untroubled faith.

C. A. BARTOL.

## THE SKEPTICISM OF BAYLE.

THE word "skepticism" has a philosophical and a popular signification. As a philosophical term, it designates a speculative distrust of the faculties of man, which leads to the denial of all certainty in the attainment of truth. Jouffroy denominates it "absolute skepticism;" that is, "a disposition produced by such a view of our means of acquiring truth as leads to the conclusion that we are incompetent to attain to any certain knowledge." Morell defines it to be "a distrust of the validity of the intellectual faculties and of the authority of the human reason." This skepticism is as old as philosophy itself; but it reached its climax in the assertion of those Pyrrhonists in Greece who said, "We assert nothing—no, not even that we assert nothing."

The modern era of philosophical skepticism begins with the reaction from the system of Descartes, who posited everything, God, the universe, and human personality, upon thought. He was followed by a very different set of speculators, who found that reason logically called for one belief, and the church another. It was soon seen that the result of rationalism would be a complete theological skepticism, wherein all the incomprehensible doctrines of the church would be denied. Then the defenders of Christianity became philosophical skeptics; they denied the validity of the reason, and its power of attaining any sure knowledge of the truth. The most earnestly religious man of his time, Pascal, was a philosophical skeptic. There was in him a terrible energy of skepticism. He conquers it by force, but does not rise above it into a serener air. He could find refuge only in implicit submission to the church. If he allowed himself to speculate, there opened before him the dreadful abyss, bottomless, unfathomable, where all was darkness and despair. "I do not know," he says, with a shudder, "who has put me into the world, nor what the world is, nor what I am myself. I am in terrible ignorance of all things. I know not what is my body, what my senses, what my soul: and that very part of me which thinks what I am saying, which reflects upon everything, and upon itself, no more knows itself than the rest." What could so show his utter distrust of the human reason as his once "tossing up" in order to determine whether God exists, and whether the soul is immortal?

Skepticism could go no farther in this direction after it had main-

tained that it was only by faith that we could know our own existence, or the existence of anything. This skepticism is the commonplace of theological rhetoric. But the Protestant writer who is its best exponent is Bayle. He is not a scoffer at Christianity, but only a sly jester at certain arguments by which truths supposed essential to Christianity were upheld. He always professed a belief in revelation, and he conformed to religious observances. But he was a genuine philosophical skeptic; and he opposed both dogmatism, on the one hand, and rationalism, on the other, by the same keen thrust of equilibrated reason. Carlyle, speaking of Voltaire, says, that, "when he appeared on the arena, Bayle, his countryman, had just finished a life spent in preaching skepticism precisely similar, and by precisely similar methods." But this is not the fact. Neither their methods nor their skepticism were alike. Bayle never harangues, denounces, or scorches with burning invective, Christian institutions and Christian doctrines. He presents all arguments for and against, so that it is hard to tell what *is* his own personal conviction. He is a critic, and loves to show each weak point, each flaw, and each absurdity; but he does not, from his armed chariot of destruction, mow down with relentless onslaught that which stands in his way. Voltaire believes, moreover, in an adequate natural light of souls. "It is absurd, odious, abominable," he says, "to suppose that God enlightens all eyes, and plunges almost all souls in darkness. The conscience which he has given to all men is their universal law." Bayle says, "The false light of reason is such that it cannot be distinguished from the true, except by the light of faith." Bayle rightly styles himself "a historian and commentator, not a dogmatist nor a rationalist." He delights in showing by acutest reasoning that reason is of no avail, but he never says, that, reason being insufficient, we have no other guide. He brings up, face to face, opposing combatants, and lets them have full swing to sweep each other from the field. But Voltaire will have nothing to do with these scholastic reasonings. Away with your theology and your metaphysics! "Theology," he says, "has never done any good except to turn the brain, and sometimes upset states. It alone makes atheists. It gives absurd ideas of God, and, because theology is a chimera, it is concluded that God is a chimera too." He does not care what arguments this man or the other uses to reconcile God's perfection with man's sin. He will not stop to hear metaphysicians discuss, much less to refute them. "Here is man," he says: "if he were perfect, he would be God; and these pretended contrarieties and contradictions,—they are all a part of man, who is, like the rest of nature, what he ought to be." And so he cuts the

Gordian knot, and will not waste himself in untwisting the separate threads.

The leading characteristic of Bayle's skepticism may be inferred from his favorite author, Montaigne, who lived in the previous century. It is said of him that he drew over his name an emblematic pair of scales, and wrote, "*Que sçais je ?*" ("What know I?") under it. And thus did Bayle try in turn all the leading doctrines of the sects in his critical scales, and found as the result that there was no preponderance in the beam. He gave no verdict for reason in favor of any of the scholastic dogmas. The arguments which reason advanced, reason could also throw down. I *believe*, he said, but I do not know. I believe in one only principle of good, but reason can only establish it by making God the author of evil. I believe in Providence and immortality, but reason has much to say on the other side. You religionists are inconsequent in your logic: let truth have its own way to the end. Your dogmatism and your rationalism are equally baseless. And here the wary old critic but expresses in the bald, stiff language of prose that which is the mood, at times, of sincerest souls, and which the poet of our day embodies in his flowing verse: —

"Behold! we *know* not anything:  
I can but trust that good shall fall  
At last, — far off, — at last, to all,  
And every winter change to spring.

"So runs my dream; but what am I?  
An infant crying in the night;  
An infant crying for the light;  
And with no language but a cry."

Voltaire himself, in a few words, rightly describes Bayle's position as a skeptic: "About a hundred observations, scattered up and down in Bayle's Dictionary, have acquired him immortal reputation. He has left the controversy concerning the origin of evil undecided. He lays all manner of opinions before his readers; all the arguments by which they are supported, and all the arguments by which they may be contested, are discussed by him; he is, as it were, the recorder of philosophers, but he never gives his own opinions. He resembles Cicero, who often, in his philosophical works, assumes the character of an academician who decides nothing." "He never, however, denies Providence or the immortality of the soul. And his adversaries should endeavor to learn of him moderation and the art of reason-

ing." And in his poem on "The Destruction of Lisbon" he thus truly characterizes Bayle's method:—

"What do I learn from Bayle? to *doubt* alone:  
 Bayle, great and wise, all systems overthrows,  
 Then his own tenets labors to oppose;  
 Like Samson, blind amid Philistine's bands,  
 Crushed 'neath the pile demolished by his hands."

Pierre Bayle was born in Carla, France, 1647. His father was a minister of the Protestant Church. He received a classical education, and a training in the scholastic philosophy at home and at school, early manifesting an ardent love of study, which amounted almost to a passion for books. He went at the age of twenty-two to the University of Toulouse, a Jesuit college; and there he was won over to the profession of the Catholic faith. The account which Bayle himself gives of this change is as follows: "I was lodged with a priest. I went to Toulouse full of doubt upon my religion through reading a multitude of books of controversy. The priest, debating with me, only increased my doubts, and, at last, convinced me that my religion was false. I left it, and continued my studies at the college for eighteen months. Afterwards the first impressions in which I had been educated returned, and I re-embraced the religion in which I was born, and went to Geneva to continue my studies." He then became private tutor in several private families at Rouen and at Paris, and afterwards was Professor of Philosophy at Sedan. When this college was broken up by the edict of Louis XIV., he went to Rotterdam, at the age of thirty-five, by invitation of the municipal authorities, who appointed him Professor of Philosophy and History in a school established by the city. A few years before his death he was deprived of this office through the intrigues of his theological enemies, though ostensibly on political grounds. But he refused advantageous offers to go to the Hague and to England, and died at Rotterdam, in 1706, leaving behind him with those who knew him best the character of an honest, virtuous, and learned man.

With the exception of a monthly periodical, then a wholly novel institution, called "The News of the Republic of Letters," and "The Philosophical Dictionary," his writings were on theological and metaphysical questions. It is impossible reading, except parts of the Dictionary, for us of this day, entering into the disputed points of Calvinism and Catholicism, "fate, free-will, fore-knowledge absolute," full of keen logic, and as much good common-sense as can be mingled in

such debates. He wrote, too, in favor of unlimited religious toleration. His extreme fairness to all the arguments of foes as well as friends, his impartiality in admitting whatever was true, whether it could be turned to the advantage of one sect or another, one school of philosophy or another, caused him to be accused of indifference to all truth, of Pyrrhonism, of Atheism, and whatever other term there was opprobrious and malignant in the not very select vocabulary of theological disputants. It is true that those who wish to find the strongest statements of reasons against the doctrines of the church might meet with them in Bayle. And if the arguments on the other side did or did not kick the beam, was that his fault? He was the historian and critic of opinions, and could not, in that capacity, advocate any. These dialectics served him for recreation; and, whenever he wanted to rest himself, he says that he wrote some controversial book. The worthy members of the ecclesiastical body with which he was connected gave him once the following advice: "To take care not to refute inconsiderately what *our* theologians have said against certain vicious popes; and that it was unjust to take the side of seducers who have done so much harm to the church."

The position of Bayle in regard to skepticism is thus stated by Tennemann: "He ceased to confide even in the possibility of a positive rational knowledge, and brought himself to believe that reason was clear-sighted enough to detect error, but not sufficiently so, without external aid, to attain to truth. In short, that without a revelation from above she only leads astray." Now, the remarkable fact we are to consider is, that this skepticism of Bayle is the approved orthodoxy of the present time. This is the leading doctrine of a work published as one of the series of "The Bampton Lectures," and preached before the University of Oxford, on the foundation of John Bampton, for defending Christianity against "heretics and schismatics." The whole substance of Mansel's "Limits of Religious Thought" is this principle of the skeptic Bayle: That there is no faculty in man by which he can know God; that there is no direct communion between the spirit of God and the spirit of man; that man has no ability to know absolutely what love, goodness, truth are; that his knowledge of divine realities is all relative, and is representative, not directly presented by the object itself. In a word, that, as in the world of sense, we have to do only with phenomena and appearances, so it is in the sphere of spiritual things, — that God does not touch the soul by his presence, and impart his life, but gives externally certain representations, figures, symbols of himself, accommodated to man's finite nature,

and adapted to his subjective weaknesses and limitations. We cannot know whether these stand for real qualities in the Creator or not; we are to take them in all humility as the best we can get, repress all the yearnings of the soul after a perfect conformity with God, be satisfied with the evidences which they bring, and no longer listen to that thirsting, wailing cry from within after God, — after the *living* God, the actual Inspirer, the ever-present Spirit of Truth and Love.

Let us place side by side some parallel statements of Mansel and Bayle. Bayle says that "he would not admit the ideas which men have of goodness and holiness are any standard of goodness and holiness in God." Mansel says, "Fools, to dream that man can escape from himself, that human reason can draw aught but a human portrait of God."

Bayle says, "It is the very property of evangelical mysteries to be exposed to objections which natural light cannot explain." Mansel says, "It is to be expected that our apprehension of the revealed Deity should involve mysteries inscrutable, and doubts insoluble, by our present faculties."

"There is no logical break," says Mansel, "from Socinianism to Pantheism, and from Pantheism to Atheism, and from Atheism to Pyrrhonism; and Pyrrhonism is but the suicide of reason itself." Now, not merely to assert this, but to exhibit it by practical examples, and to furnish round after round of that ladder of descent, was the delight and the work of Bayle.

Says Mansel, "The self-contradictions into which we inevitably fall, when we attempt certain courses of speculation, are the beacons placed by the hand of God in the mind of man to warn us that we are deviating from the track that he designs us to pursue; that we are striving to pass the barriers which he has planted around us. The flaming sword turns every way against those who strive, in the strength of their own reason, to force their passage to the tree of life." Now listen to Bayle: "The natural consequence of finding that our reason leads us all astray will be to renounce it as a guide. That is a great step towards the Christian religion. It is a favorable disposition towards faith to know the defects of the reason; and hence it is that M. Pascal and others have said, that, in order to correct the liberals, it was necessary to mortify the reason, and teach them to distrust it. And yet there are sensible people who maintain that there is nothing more opposed to religion than Pyrrhonism."

These parallelisms might be indefinitely multiplied. But Bayle has been handed down as an atheist and a skeptic; Mansel is regarded as



the defender of the faith. It would be to many an entire obscuration, — yes, a blotting out from their firmament of God and virtue and holiness and immortality, to adopt his philosophy of divine things ; yet no one hurls at him the accusation of atheism, impiety, or infidelity. It has been well said of his logic, that, in mowing down its thistle-field, it inconsiderately mows off its own legs.

In the period in which Bayle lived we perceive the influence of that new era of thought, that has since gone on with such rapid advance, beginning to manifest itself. He was contemporary with Newton, Leibnitz, and Locke, and was in relations with the greatest men of his time. The experimental method of Bacon was rapidly undermining the whole received philosophy of the past. There was a tendency very evident towards divesting science, religion, and philosophy of the scholastic, exclusive, and ecclesiastic dress which they had hitherto worn. The lofty systems of absolute metaphysics, which pronounced *a priori* upon creation, Providence, and nature, and were identified with revelation itself, were passing away. Philosophy, expelled from the sanctuary of the church, took up its abode among earthly interests, and turned from the traditionally divine to human hospitality.

Cousin rightly says of Bayle that he is "much more the father of Voltaire than Hume." Hume is a systematic skeptic. He is thoroughly steeped in the logic and principles of definite syllogism of denial ; and, grant him his premises, he will lead one by the straightest path to a positive conclusion. Bayle, on the other hand, balances arguments, and makes no assertion or demonstration. He is too much a skeptic of the powers of reason to reach any such firm position of denial. He is distrustful of human reason, and endeavors to show by the facility with which arguments can be answered that there is no sure ground upon which to stand except revelation, positive and direct, of divine truths. But Voltaire takes up those weapons which philosophical skepticism had used in order to bring men back to the absolute authority of faith, and wields them against the church itself. He becomes the great hierarch of theological skepticism.

An exception to Bayle's position of historiographer, giving both sides and "affirming nothing," is to be found in his article on Spinoza. Here he follows a method of treatment most offensive, and entirely in the spirit of a partisan. He charges him with having "reduced atheism to a system," and attacks the whole spirit and tenor of his philosophy. He gives no quarter and makes no allowance, as in all other cases, for Spinoza's own point of view as sincere and as the legitimate successor of Descartes and Malebranche. He calls him repeatedly

"this atheist," and speaks in harsh terms of "the venom and artifice of which he is guilty." To some of his opinions, as he understands them, he appends the epithets, "prodigious absurdity!" "execrable abomination!" Throughout he argues against him as a special pleader, and in the spirit of a one-sided attorney, which he elsewhere so pointedly condemns in the philosopher and theologian. However much Bayle's contemporaries may have accused him of atheism, he is surely no atheist of the Spinozistic type.

Cousin is mistaken in saying that Bayle advanced for the first time, in his "Thoughts on Comets," the principle, "That a false or unworthy idea of God is worse than indifference or atheism." Bacon had already said, in his "Essay of Superstition," "It were better to have no God at all than such an opinion as is unworthy of him; for the one is unbelief, the other contumely." And he quotes also Plutarch as saying, "Surely, I had rather, a great deal, men should say, 'There was no such man at all as Plutarch,' than that they should say, 'That there was one Plutarch that could eat his children as soon as they were born,' as the poets speak of Saturn. And atheism," he says farther, "leaves a man to sense; to philosophy; to natural piety; to laws; to reputation: all which may be guides to an outward moral virtue; but superstition dismounts all these. Atheism did never perturb states, and the times inclined to atheism were civil times; but superstition hath been the confusion of many states."

Bayle is more just towards Mahomet than he is towards Spinoza, defending him from many of the popular charges and the common staple of ecclesiastic abuse then universally heaped upon him. He sees in his success something else than an appeal to sensual passions. He will not allow that Christians have such an advantage as they claim over Mohammedans in regard to the virtues and humanities of life. Because a man is a Turk or an infidel, he does not think that he is to be looked upon as out of the pale of God and honor and mercy and human love. He sees the faults both of Protestants and Catholics: that on both sides there are misunderstandings, calumnies, passions, blind zeal, ignorance, and party spirit. If an author is 'accused' unjustly of holding certain opinions, he defends him; he tracks out charges to their source, and sifts fairly all the evidence. He gives generally the most charitable construction, though a reader would infer at once, from his references to woman, that he was a bachelor, and that he had no reverence for her nature, and no true idea of what constitutes love.

Bayle has rendered a lasting service to theology, by showing the

weakness of those arguments that are brought to sustain the unreasonable dogmas of religionists. This, however, is worse in their eyes than a total denial. There is good common-sense advice in the observation, "I am convinced more strongly than ever that the best reply one can make, if he does not consult revelation, to the question, 'Why has God permitted that man should sin?' would be to say, 'I know nothing about it; I believe only that he has had reasons very worthy of his infinite wisdom, but incomprehensible to me.'" This is certainly very far from a Pyrrhonic indifference or a scoffing infidelity. It is a reply which must commend itself to every one but the self-conceited reasoner, or the narrow bigot, who, while he desires to have all the credit of an evangelical belief, would also recommend his own depth of philosophical acumen, and his own ability to defend what the bravest and boldest have given up as untenable. It is to be feared that there are many who hold the doctrine of the insufficiency of reason only in a Pickwickian sense. They are exceedingly offended when their theoretical postulate of the nothingness of human reason is shown to be the soberest and most real of facts.

The defenders of Christianity have not been willing to rest their cause upon the faith of the heart, upon the highest spiritual intuitions, upon divine and everlasting realities of the soul. While denouncing human reason, they have endeavored to marshal in their defense the logical understanding, and have appealed to it and to it alone. It is, indeed, to be doubted whether the many volunteer defenders of Christianity have not injured rather than benefited the cause of which they were the champions. As Voltaire said, "They have wished to hold up an oak by twining around it vines; and one can take away these useless vines without fearing to injure the oak."

C. C. SHACKFORD.

# PERMIT.

FROM GOETHE'S WEST-EASTERLY DIVAN.

## Hour.

AS I hold the watch to-day  
At the gate of Paradise,  
Shall I bid, or turn away?  
Thou'rt suspicious in my eyes.

*Permit.*

Art thou kin in flesh and spirit  
Truly to our Moslem race?  
Have thy battles, has thy merit,  
Thee commended to this place?

Dost thou count among our heroes?  
Then point out thy wounds to me,  
That record thee something famous,  
And thy usher I will be.

*Poet.*

Too much haggling at the portal!  
Once for all just let me in:  
For I've been a man — a mortal —  
That's a fighter to have been.

Sharpen now thy powerful glances,  
Through this bosom let them rove;  
See the malice of life's lances,  
See the lusty wounds of love.

And my song was in faith's manner:  
That a constant love might burn,  
That the world unto its planner  
Leal might be, howe'er it turn.

And I worked towards my betters —  
With them too, until my name  
On the fairest hearts in letters  
Of delight began to flame.

No! Thou choosest not poor singers:  
Give thy hand, that day by day  
I upon thy tender fingers  
Eternities may count away.

J. W.

## NOTES.

“**PSYCHIC FORCE**” is the new term by which Mr. Crookes, of London, designates the “spiritual” power of which Mr. Home is the most famous representative,—a peculiar “force proceeding directly from the nervous systems of specially constituted persons, and which is exerted independently of the nervous system.” The tests to which Mr. Crookes, Dr. Huggins, and Mr. Serjeant Cox subjected Mr. Home were two. Mr. Crookes had prepared, according to the report of “The Spectator,” “a mahogany board three feet long by nine and one-half inches wide and one inch thick, one end of which rested on a pine table and the other was supported by a spring balance hanging from a substantial tripod stand, with a self-registering index attached. Any pressure exerted on this board at any point nearer to the balance than the spot where it was supported on the table tended to depress the end supported by the balance to an extent registered by the index,—the board moving round the table-supported end as round a fulcrum. Mr. Crookes, to test the balance, stood on one foot at the end of the board nearest to the table, and Dr. Huggins said that the whole weight of his body then applied (one hundred and forty pounds) only sank the index to an amount equivalent to one and one-half pounds if applied to the balance end, when he stood still, and to two pounds when he jerked up and down. Mr. Home, sitting in a low easy-chair, simply applied his fingers lightly to the exact point where the board rested on the table (so that even hard pressure there would have only had the effect of securing the fulcrum instead of depressing the other end of the mahogany board), and under these conditions the opposite end was depressed by an amount which varied, as if in waves, between three and one-half and six pounds, which was the maximum attained.”

This experiment was fully attested by the three scientific gentlemen above named, and was regarded as evidence of the actual existence of some real force not due to “muscular exertion.”

The other experiment was that of an accordion enclosed in a drum-shaped cage made of laths of wood and copper wire, with only an opening at the top large enough for Mr. Home to take hold of the accordion with one hand. The cage was placed underneath the table. “The observers on each side kept their feet on Mr. Home’s feet to prevent any use of them, and one of Mr. Home’s hands was placed

on the table and carefully observed ; the other first held the accordion by the top, but the rest of the accordion was completely inside the cage, so as to be inaccessible." Thus held, the accordion began to vibrate, and finally played tunes. Mr. Crookes says further, that, when Mr. Home placed both hands above the table, the instrument continued to float inside the cage and play tunes.

Upon the strength of these facts as attested by himself and his two associates, Mr. Crookes prepared and offered to the Royal Society, of which he is a member, a paper claiming the discovery of "Psychic Force." But the Committee of the Royal Society have declined it, affirming that "the Royal Society is open to communications advocating the existence of a force in nature as yet unknown, if they contain scientific evidence adequate to establish its probability ; but that, looking to the inherent improbability of the case stated by Mr. Crookes, and the entire want of scientific precision in the evidence educed by him, the paper was not regarded as one deserving the attention of the Royal Society." All of which means that the Royal Society is not going to earn the opprobrium of making itself appear ridiculous before the world by doing a thing that would be indiscreet. If it admits the existence of "psychic force," and then is unable to explain whence it originates, the chances are that it would, by popular inference at least, be compelled to give countenance to the ready-made theory of the agency of invisible beings. The Royal Society must have these facts verified and put beyond the shadow of a doubt. And perhaps this is just as well. Yet one may wonder why, upon the testimony of three most trustworthy witnesses,—all of them members of its own body,—it should be so economical of its time as not to be willing to give the matter at least a brief attention. But Mr. Crookes is evidently enlisted for the cause, and will be likely to furnish the Royal Society with further and more "adequate" tests, or explode the imposture to which he and his associates have become victims.

As to the result of these experiments "The Spectator" remarks as follows:—

Of course these asserted facts must be taken with great reserve, unless verified by sufficient repetition under every guarantee the scientific world may suggest. But, should they be so verified, and we think the existing testimony is quite sufficient to make this hypothesis conceivable, a good many more matters should be carefully investigated ; for instance, this,—whether any tune could be so played which Mr. Home himself could not play on the accordion, or any which none of the persons present were able to play on the accordion, or any with which none of those present were acquainted,—or whether, if none of these cases happened, it was only Mr. Home's knowledge of music, or indifferently that of any other of the per-

sons present, which the tune appeared to represent. One thing is certain, that, if the facts asserted be true at all, the force moving the accordion must be in some way connected with a musically educated mind. The wind does not execute even "a well-known sweet and plaintive melody" on the *Æolian* harp. The movements of the accordion must clearly have been governed by the musical associations of some mind, and whether these were voluntary or involuntary, — and either the one or the other is quite conceivable, — it would be possible, one would think, to determine the mind in which they originated. Supposing the fact established, there is in it little that is more wonderful than the power of absolutely writing by telegraph, so that specific vibrations given to the wires at one end cause given words to be written off at the other, — for of course, if there really be "a nerve-atmosphere of various intensity round each individual," the vibrations given to such an atmosphere by distinct acts of thought might produce corresponding contractions in the accordion. This is, however, purely speculative; but, if these things are true at all, it must be determinable where the mental source of the tune played by the accordion is, and no point could be of greater interest. The analogy would be close — though there would be one great difference — with established facts of the kind sometimes called electro-biological. We have been repeatedly assured by men of the highest trustworthiness that the power belongs to men of certain temperament to influence by strong silent will the action of certain other persons, so that by expending a great deal of silent effort, for instance, on the desire that a given man shall scratch the tip of his left ear, that man is at last compelled, with no knowledge whatever of the reason, to scratch the tip of his left ear. That such facts as these have been repeatedly verified is, we believe, certain. And the only difference in this case may be that the same kind of effect is produced on the motions of an inanimate object like an accordion, — certainly most curious, as the facts we have alluded to are most curious, — but certainly also not more *impossible* than the others. What, however, we now wish to insist on is, that there is *prima facie* evidence, a true bill found which ought to be sent for scientific trial, in relation to this matter. Even Dr. Huggins declares thus much, and Dr. Huggins is an authority such as no scientific man will dare for a moment to dispute. Whether there be a "new force" on the eve of discovery is not yet proved; but that there is sufficient suspicion of the exertion of such a force to render it most desirable that the scientific world should either confirm or explode the hypothesis of its existence, and in the former case study its laws, is hardly disputable.

THE real question is not whether intelligent Catholics of America approve, or, with "The Pilot," condemn the rioters of New York; but whether, if the Catholic Church were in power here, it would not in the name of *law and order* carry out the purposes of the mob? We have pretty good — shall we say *infallible*? — authority for believing that it would. We can give the following language no other construction. In a recent speech to a French delegation, the Pope, denouncing the liberalism of French Catholics, said, —

I remember a Frenchman who was a man of rank and well known here in Rome, and paid me great respect. He was a distinguished man, an honorable man; he practiced his religion, he went to confession; but he held some strange principles, principles which I know not how to reconcile with



sincere Catholicism. Thus, for example, he told me that the law ought to be Godless, *favor every one alike*, Protestants as well as others. We agreed on some points, but *never on that*.

Now, do the Catholics in this country side with the Pope, or with the distinguished man with whom the Pope could not agree? If the Pope cannot reconcile "sincere Catholicism" with the idea that the law should protect or "favor everybody alike," can they?

THE Frenchman's real meaning evidently was that the law should be *Pope-less*. His holiness might have added to his list of virtues that of his being a prophet. The "strange doctrine" already prevails in Rome. The "law" there is *Popeless*. So it is the world over. But is it for that reason *God-less*?

"By renouncing the assurances that come from supernatural revelation touching the subject of a future life," says "The Religious Magazine," "the Free Religionists are thrown back upon the evidences of science and nature." It would be interesting, to say the least, to have a Unitarian supernaturalist define just what *he* means by "a supernatural revelation," and also give a clear statement of the number and character of those "assurances" of which we hear so much in a general way. Shall we have it?

A LITTLE sheet published in St. Louis, called "The Communist,"—whose motto is, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his wants—Equality, Friendship, Fraternity,"—takes good care to clear its skirts from the odium of "the so-called Communists of France," whom it declares "are not Communists." It says,—

The word "Commune," in the French language, means simply a *small territorial district in France*, without regard to the principle of a community of property and labor; and so the supporters of the Commune, as such, were not Communists in the proper meaning of the term, but they were Federalists, as they called themselves, and simply aimed to establish a certain political reform embracing the right of each Commune (territorial district) to manage its own local affairs.

There is one other reason, perhaps, why many use the word "Communism," and that is, those who are either ignorant of its true meaning or prejudiced against it apply it reproachfully to all the different phases of reform.

But "Communism" has long been well defined in all our dictionaries, to which all can refer, and its definite meaning of "common interests" is always suggestive of friendship and good will. It is a term sacred and dear to all true friends of humanity, and it will outlive and finally triumph over all the odium or opposition that can be brought against it or its advocates.

MR. J. B. HARRISON writes in "Old and New" about "Methodism."

He has this reference to Emerson which appears to us rather surprising:—

I find more of the best things of Methodism in the writings of Emerson than anywhere else, and I wish that he and the Methodists could think it worth while to try to understand each other. Emerson's statements are almost perfect till we come to one fatal error. He saw long ago, as few in our time had seen, the significance of personal organization or individual character—saw that, as it appears from one side, it is invincible; and he was so much impressed by its wondrous potency that he could not believe that it is plastic and accessible even to the Infinite Spirit of which it is the creature and expression. The testimony of history and of continued experience shows, beyond dispute, that no difficulty in natural organization or character can bar out from the consenting soul the Spirit of God, which makes all things possible wherever it comes. And Methodism is above Emerson in this, that while he thinks that when God has once made a man he cannot do much for him afterward, but the man must do all for himself, because organization is fate, Methodism holds that the power which first made a man can make him over again, several times if it is necessary, till he is fitted to be an instrument in the right hand of his Maker for the performance of work which angels might be proud to be permitted to do.

Mr. Harrison in his reading of Emerson is evidently off the track. Has he read "The Over Soul"? We are not aware that Mr. Emerson teaches that God makes a man and then retires. We suspect that he would say, that, instead of retiring from his work, he is ever busy, and hasn't made a man yet.

"Organization is fate." But fate is *fated* to be overruled by the conquering "Spirit of God" in man. To deny that were sad. But it is not that the Spirit of God is roving about seeking *admission* to the "consenting soul" of man. It is the spirit of the man himself that, when it puts forth its power, abolishes the old and establishes a new order of things, becomes the Lord over fate. When is this spirit most manifest? When the man is making himself over by using the power within him, or when he says, "Here I wait for God!" While he waits, God waits; when he acts, God acts. He himself is the God or the slave.

THE union of Church and State, and the subordinate place of the State, is vigorously presented by "The Catholic World." "The secular is not the highest," is the conclusion it arrives at. The Protestant world, to be consistent with its practice, should cry "Amen" to this. For there is not a country where Protestantism is in the ascendant in which ecclesiastical notions or religious prejudices of some description do not in some direction control the action of the State. Witness the use of the Bible in the Public Schools and Courts of Justice; the Sabbatarian laws. The complete divorce of Church and State will be

accomplished when the State leaves the Church to itself entirely, and deals with all on the simple basis of citizenship, establishing justice and equality in the protection of individual rights and privileges.

MRS. PAULINE C. DAVIS openly pleads for what she calls "Free Love." However wrong she may be in her idea of the institution of marriage, it is evident that she is not pleading to her own mind for *lust*, free or otherwise. It is but common decency to agree that all persons whose discourse is sincere and intelligent should be allowed such a hearing as they can obtain, without having raised against them the cry of "mad dog," let the subject be what it may. In regard to the question of divorce, there is no dodging it. It is one of the open questions of the time, and will be discussd. And why should it not be? The only way to lay the ghost is to face it. If our present laws are founded in justice and virtue, shall we fear that they will be stricken from the statute book, or disastrously modified? Such a fear is the baldest infidelity to our free and republican institutions. What is our boast? Why, simply that there is *no* question of public interest which may not be trusted to the good sense of the people — to untrammelled discussion; and that the verdict so obtained will be found to be in the line of the public good.

MRS. VICTORIA C. WOODHULL accepts the nomination to the Presidency of the United States tendered her by "The Victoria League." The new party is to be called "The Equal Rights Party." Mrs. Woodhull is sanguine of success. She says, in her letter of acceptance, —

I feel that I *know* that just the right woman to touch the right chord of the public sympathy and confidence — if the right woman could be found — would arouse such a tempest of popularity as the country has never seen, and as a consequence would ride triumphantly on the tide of a joyous popular tumult to the supreme political position.

Mrs. Woodhull believes in her name, and accepts the "graceful allusion" to it as a "favoring omen" which the Committee, in their letter to her, made: —

It is true that a Victoria rules the great rival nation opposite to us on the other side of the Atlantic, and it might grace the amity just sealed between the two nations, and be a new security of peace, if a twin sisterhood of Victorias were to preside over the two nations. It is true, also, that in its mere etymology the name signifies *Victory!* and the victory for the right is what we are bent on securing. It is again true, also, that to some minds there is a consonant harmony between the idea and the word, so that its euphonious utterance seems to their imaginations to be itself a genius of success.

However this may be, I have sometimes thought, myself, that there is, perhaps, something providential and prophetic in the fact that my parents were prompted to confer on me a name which forbids the very thought of failure; and, as the great Napoleon believed the star of his destiny, you will at least excuse me, and charge it to the credulity of the woman, if I believe, also, in fatality of triumph as somehow inhering in my name.

We are in receipt of Mrs. Woodhull's speech on "The Great Political Issue of Equality." It is, probably, a much better speech than Grant could make. But then, President Woodhull, probably, would never smoke. And that a smoking President is preferable to an oratorical one, all Americans know by sad experience. And then, Woodhull would have ideas and a policy of her own, which would be no gain. She believes in "sudden revolutions," and we should all be at sea, and sick enough, perchance. The age is one of speed, and quick over-night growths. Mrs. Woodhull would give Congress just so much time, and no more, in which to accept her recommendations, — which, by the way, wouldn't be so bad a thing as at first thought it seems, — and then she would proceed with something decisive. We judge so. And our opinion is formed from her own words. We quote:—

*We will have our rights. We say no longer, By your leave. We have besought, argued, and convinced, but we have failed; and we will not fail.*

*We will try you just once more.* If the very next Congress refuse women all the legitimate results of citizenship; if they indeed merely so much as fail by a proper declaratory act to withdraw every obstacle to the most ample exercise of the franchise, — then we give, here and now, deliberate notification of what we will do next.

There is one alternative left, and we have resolved on that. This convention is for the purpose of this declaration. As surely as one year passes, from this day, and this right is not fully, frankly, and unequivocally considered, we shall proceed to call another convention expressly to frame a new constitution, and to erect a new government, complete in all its parts, and to take measures to maintain it as effectually as men do theirs.

If for people to govern themselves is so unimportant a matter as men now assert it to be, they could not justify themselves in interfering. If, on the contrary, it is the important thing we conceive it to be, they can but applaud us for exercising our right.

We mean treason; we mean secession, and on a thousand times grander scale than was that of the South. We are plotting revolution; we will overthrow this bogus republic, and plant a government of righteousness in its stead, which shall not only profess to derive its power from the consent of the governed, but shall do so in reality.

THE case of Gen. Butler is unique. No other man can create such a furor, and put everybody so completely out of their wits. He says, "I want to be Governor. It is an honorable ambition. I mean to strive for the position by all fair means." And straightway, not only Massachusetts, but the whole country, is alarmed. By some subtle

witchery he may control the September convention, and cajole the people everywhere into casting their ballots for him. How he does it, nobody knows. He went to Congress triumphantly, in the very face and eyes of all the most respectable people the State could boast, who opposed him bitterly. Now, why is this so? Why is everybody against him, and why will everybody vote for him? "There is no doubt of his being a rascal," everybody says; but then, he is *smart*; he has brains! If we can keep him on the right track, he will prove a most efficient helper of our cause. He is a man whom all parties, disbelieving in him as a genuine and righteous man, are nevertheless disposed to *risk*. "*If* he prove true," they say, and then, guess and believe that he *will*. So the Prohibitionists feel like risking him, and the Woman's Rights party think favorably of him, and the Labor party deem him, so far as *their* reform goes, almost, if not quite, above suspicion. Will he be the next Governor of Massachusetts? There never was a more puzzling question. For, as we have already as much as intimated, nobody would be surprised to discover on the morning after election that, although everybody had decided on voting against him, he had been, *somehow*, overwhelmingly elected.

THE present is not the time, if such a step is advisable at all, to prohibit processions in the streets of our cities. When the privilege is fairly conceded to all alike, and no mob mutters and threatens, the question may be entertained on the ground of public convenience. And when that time arrives, it will then be an open question, not to be hastily acted upon. For to banish everything from its streets which does not come under the head of "business" is not likely to improve the temper of a city. It is well to remind the business-world occasionally, that life has other aims and aspirations equal to money-getting. A band of music is a very grateful relief from the rattling of the horse-cars, express-wagons, and the wear and tear of steady labor to the toiling people along the way. Eager faces at all the windows speak their protest.

THE old Brattle-Street Church, in Boston, erected ninety-eight years ago, has just been vacated by the society under the ministry of Dr. Lothrop. Dr. Lothrop preached a farewell sermon from the old pulpit Sunday, July 30. He gave an interesting history of the origin of the church, and its trials in revolutionary times. He claimed that it originated in a popular demand for greater freedom than the old Puritan discipline allowed. But he would not have his hearers think that their

fathers, who conducted that first battle with Puritanism, were bad people. "They were not reckless and conceited disorganizers; they were not come-outers and radicals according to the modern use of those terms." It must be true that they did not "come out" very far,—unless we are to suppose that their successors of this generation have gone back on their fathers. Yet they did go so far astray as to be severely denounced for their disorganizing tendencies by the D.D.s of that period. And thus "history repeats itself." D.D.s will continue the same, world without end.

ARE we to have the cross on the October sky? There are rumors of floods of petitions being poured into the Infinite Ear for a "sign." If Christianity be true, will the Lord signify the same to the present generation by making his mark [†] on the blue heavens for three successive nights! It is a most reasonable request. All the world is beginning to surmise that the "evidences of Christianity" are incomplete. There is a large and increasing class which has passed the borders of surmise and entered the domain of certainty, as it thinks. Now what could be more in harmony with divine goodness and the urgent necessities of the age than such a display as this that is proposed? By all means, let there be no obstacle put in the way of its success. The Christian world has gone for a long term now without any first-class sensation. It is high time that there was a stir in the camp of the good old-fashioned sort. Is there not some Gilmore among the "praying bands" of the country to organize and carry successfully through this magnificent enterprise? There would be an appropriateness then in All-the-world's Jubilee which now it seems to lack.

It would be a capital idea, if this experiment with Heaven prove successful, to follow up the divine favor. Let there be a delegation from the heavenly country at the great Jubilee. Why not, Mr. Gilmore? And let your note read, "As an extra Christian evidence, please favor us with the same choir that once sang 'Peace on earth' over the plains of Bethlehem." The "praying bands" everywhere will joyfully take charge of your petition. This would be a piece of evidence that would be unimpeachable. As to the cross in the sky, while Mr. Home is alive we should, we confess, harbor a grain of suspicion.

"ZION'S HERALD" never hears of a terrible calamity but it sees the finger of God. It asks, —

What say the non-religionists to such calamities? How can the wild abominations of the hour link these dread facts to their professed philoso-

phy? What have the false teachers of falser morals and faith to say to such dispensations? Oh, it was a rotten boiler, a heedless engineer, a careless inspector, a parsimonious company. What if it was? Do these make death? Do they give water its power to burst iron, and to scald and drown human beings, to tear babes in pieces, to toss men in the air, to hurl hundreds to eternity? Who creates death? Who tramples out the life of man?

Strong Son of God! Immortal Love!  
Thou makest life in man and brute;  
Thou makest death, and oh! Thy foot  
Is on the skull that Thou hast made!

Who? That is the question the authorities are anxious to settle. Who was to blame? Who gave to the "water its power to burst iron, and to scald and drown human beings?" If it was *not* "the engineer," the "careless inspector," or "a parsimonious company," the public is interested in knowing the fact. Mr. Haven, you slander God. If the boiler was *not* rotten, or the engineer had done *his* duty, would the water have had "power" thus to "hurl hundreds to eternity"? Water will rush down hill, but of its own free will it never exploded anything.

WE promised a further word in answer to Mr. Howard.

How can any one *too* profoundly believe what he *knows* to be true?

One may so zealously push what he believes as to disgust the world with it and himself. He may assert his truth so dogmatically as virtually to proclaim himself infallible and all the rest of the world fools. A little margin of doubt as to one's ability to declare the whole truth is a healthy thing for any mind.

By the truth of God, I mean truth that God has clearly revealed to man: truth which, though of the first importance to man, could never have been discovered by unaided human intelligence.

We fail to discover that this is not pure assumption. How does Mr. Howard know where lie the bounds of human intelligence? How can he decide that every truth the human intelligence is in possession of, it has not discovered of itself? The assumption of revelation is gratuitous and unsupported even by a rational inference.

The comparison instituted between an infallible Bible and an infallible Pope seems to me to be unfortunate. The infallible Pope insists that we should surrender reason. The Bible says, 'Come, let us reason together.'

The Bible itself claims nothing. It is not *one* book, but *many*. Each book is as independent of the other as are the articles in THE RADICAL, and more so. The Bible writers did not write for the Bible. Their productions have no unity but that of being bound between the same covers. It is not what the Bible itself says, but what *men* (Christians) say of it. And what do Christians say? "Come, let us reason together, to the end that we accept the Bible as the infallible Word of God." In the same way the Pope compliments the human intelligence:



"Let us reason together, but your reasoning must reach the conclusion I have already announced."

The Pope's infallibility would avail him nothing without the power to enforce his doctrines with physical or ecclesiastical pains and penalties. The Bible has no such prerogative.

The power of the Bible, considered as an infallible book, is over the minds of men, and more enslaves them than if it were armed only with physical power. The same is true of the Pope. Had he no hold upon his subjects but that of temporal power and "pains and penalties," his infallibility would indeed avail but little. But because there are millions to believe that he cannot err, and that they must submit their judgment at last to his, the doctrine becomes dangerous. So is the same belief in regard to the Bible a great evil. Reason must succumb to all its teachings, however false and mischievous.

It would be interesting to know if you consider Mr. Hatch's conduct — so unpleasantly notorious — an exhibition of your doctrine of "the grace of good manners?"

Without endorsing all of Mr. Hatch's tract-distributing zeal, we deem him to be in possession of "the grace of good manners." We have never heard of any ungentlemanly deportment on his part. He quietly hands out his tracts, but has never said to any one that we know of, "Believe or be damned." True, he goes up to the door of a heathen temple; but he only offers its devotees a chance to compare notes. It may be a little discourteous to the infallible teacher within; but he and his kind have long claimed a like privilege. Mr. Hatch, in fact, learned to do such things while yet one of their number and a follower of "Jesus," before he had found reason for changing both head and heart.

"THE INDEX" maintains its ground and furnishes much excellent reading. There is an effort in progress to establish an Index Association with a capital of one hundred thousand dollars in shares of one hundred dollars. "No subscription is payable until fifty thousand dollars shall have been subscribed; and then only ten per cent will be payable annually. No indebtedness can be incurred in any current year by the Association beyond ten per cent. of the stock at that time actually subscribed. Subscriptions are respectfully solicited from all friends of Free Religion." The subscription has now reached some twenty-three thousand dollars. It ought to be increased to fifty thousand without delay.

THE Report of the Fourth Anniversary of the Free Religious Association is published, and is for sale at the office of THE RADICAL.

## LITERARY NOTICES.

THE EARTHWARD PILGRIMAGE. By Moncure D. Conway. London: John Camden Hotten. 1870.

Mr. Conway in this book has accomplished a rare feat of intellectual daring in a country where acts of such positive religious non-conformity have to be paid for, even by such men as John Stuart Mill, with a seat in Parliament. Indeed, the sincerity, the plainness of speech, and fearlessness as to all consequences, which mark each line of this book, cannot sufficiently be commended, as manifested amid a people whose mental health is mortally injured by the cancer of cant. The practical value of the work is, moreover, enhanced by the popular method in which the subject is treated, which will probably insure it a wide circle of miscellaneous readers.

The introductory chapter is a very clever parody of Bunyan's allegory. The pilgrim has, according to immemorial prescription, journeyed to the domain of the prince of other-worldliness; where, after having overcome the well-known difficulties, he finds himself comfortably settled on a purple cloud, blowing a golden trumpet:—

“For a time this was pleasant enough. The purple cloud acted as a screen against many disagreeable objects. The dens of misery and vice, the hard problems of thought, the blank misgivings of the wanderers amid worlds unrealized, were all shut out from view; and though I was expected, as a matter of course, to say I was a miserable sinner, it was with the distinct understanding that I was all the more our Prince's darling for saying so.”

This existence, however, becomes somewhat stale. He is also struck by some new facts about him. He notices that the wayfarers who now enter the celestial city in crowds, so far from being worn out from their painful journey, have a sleek and fat appearance. He converses with some of them, and learns “that the celestial railway had been opened, and that this had led to a tide of immigration. The pilgrim could now travel in a first-class carriage, and his pack be checked through. A pilgrim has since made the world familiar with this result of the enterprise of Mr. Smooth-it-away. His account, however, is, as I have learned, not entirely accurate; for instance, the Slough of Despond was not filled up by volumes of French and German philosophy, but by enormous editions of an English work, showing the safest way of investing in both worlds. Moreover, it is but just to say that the engineering feat by which the Hill Difficulty was tunneled is due to Prof. Moonshine, whose works, showing that the six days of creation mean six geological periods, and that miracles are due to the accelerated workings of natural law, also furnished the patent key by which many pilgrims are enabled to pass with ease through Doubting Castle.” The dangers and difficulties now, on the contrary, beset the travelers who would

journey from, not to, the Celestial City; and our pilgrim, therefore, prepares to bend his steps in the direction of the city of Destruction, to which he must go through the tedious paths of study, ideality, and devotion.

Thus by a glittering thread of fun are we lured on to face the grave problems of the present. The pilgrim lifts the mask from the apparently flourishing creed and beholds a death's head grinning behind. Wherever you touch what looks like a solid body, the seeming substance, as though you handled a mummy, crumbles into dust. There in Canterbury Cathedral an archbishop is consecrated to the music of the very chant, probably, which was sung by Augustine and his monks as they marched from the sea-shore to Canterbury. But now what a mere farce it is, not influenced by nor influencing the stirring realities around it! Here in St. Albans the ritualists believe that with the revival of mediæval candles and vestments they can also rekindle the old fervent faith that has for ever passed out of them. Wherever we turn we may see in fact, what the poet has revealed by the searing lightnings of lyric wrath, how —

Mouldering now, and hoar with moss,  
Between us and the sunlight swings  
The phantom of a Christless cross,  
Shadowing the sheltered heads of kings.

But Mr. Conway does not rest contented with exposing the purely forced existence of the Christian religion in this country, which, by a capital stroke of fancy, he likens to the fauna or flora of the tropics, only flourishing in an English park by the help of an artificial habitat. In his effort to act as a dissolvent on petrified dogmas he seeks to deprive Christianity of part of its prestige by demonstrating how its roots have derived their nourishment from the buried remains of Hindu, Greek, Scandinavian mythologies. So far from being a direct and abrupt revelation, it is an organic religious development which has absorbed into its life the spiritual and ethical sap of bygone faiths. Thus the cross, that most characteristic symbol of what is deepest in Christianity, casts its shadow far back on the first glimmer of religious thought. Christmas, believed to be hallowed by the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, has sacred associations and holly and mistletoe entwined round it by a gray pagan past, now buried sphynx-like beneath the accumulated sands of centuries. The evil spirits haunting the hill and river sides of mediæval Europe were but the transformed shapes of gods and goddesses now luring the ill-starred wanderer on to eternal perdition. Even the pitiless ugliness of those images that leer in stone from portal and crypt of the Gothic dome are but gracious Nix and Elf pressed into the service of Hell.

The author, however, does not confine his onslaught to the religious petrifications of thought. Secular forms of prejudice rouse his indignation no less. The Madonna is the starting-point which leads him to the Woman's Suffrage. He contends that woman's influence on politics would be of incalculable benefit, and aptly remarks: "She is inharmonious with every

remnant of barbarism, with all that is passing away — with war, with hustling mobs; but how stands she related with the society for which good men are striving?"

From Moses to Shelley seems also a wide leap, yet the author boldly takes it, and asserts that wherever a right and true man stands there is Mount Sinai. Shelley, of course, offers the best possible occasion to castigate that spirit of narrow bigotry which was so rampant in school, university, church, and state, and is still sufficiently thriving to convert the English Sunday to a period of monotonous gloom and lethargy. We cannot here refrain from pointing out the remarkable influence exerted by Shelley over different classes of minds. Whereas Mr. Morley, for example, in his excellent article on Byron, speaks of the "abstract humanitarianism" of Shelley, Mr. Conway, on the other hand, selects him as the most typical figure of the revolutionary poet. The fact is that his genius transcends either of these estimates. So far from having less fellow-feeling for the sufferings of humanity than Byron, he was so tortured that he might well say, —

"I am but as a nerve o'er which do creep  
The else unfelt oppressions of the earth."

But he had imbued himself too deeply with the inmost spirit of nature not to feel the unity of life at all moments of it, and that is a temper of mind incompatible with the aggressive rebellion which moans and thunders through Byron's verse. Shelley, however, brings not "the first streak of the day of Humanity," as Mr. Conway says: his soul rather projects the rays of its genius into an incalculably remote future where the transposed paradise of Dante and Milton lure on the lagging feet of mankind with the divine magic of ideal beauty.

From Shelley the transition to Mary Wollstonecraft is natural enough. This truly brave-hearted woman, the first to agitate the question of the subjection of women in that large, liberal spirit more characteristic of the close of the last century than of our age, should never be named without reverence as having inaugurated the movements whose influence is but now positively manifest. Her name inextricably connected with the protest against our present marriage laws, she herself an example of the persecution dealt inexorably by society against any one who dares attack its cherished strongholds, leads Mr. Conway on to treat of some of the drawbacks and injurious consequences of that institution. That such but too truly exist no one who unites perfect sincerity with clear-sightedness will deny. Sensuality, hypocrisy, and moral corruption, are but too often the direct result of a union which was doubtless intended to act as a safeguard against much misery and vice. But it is not so much a liberation from without as from within that must be effected ere there can be any hope of a beneficial renovation in the relations between the sexes. Else probably confusion, misery, and a thousand-fold increase of degradation, would be the result of a change. An effective re-adjustment of the laws relating to marriage can only be hoped

for when the entire position of the female sex will have undergone a radical transformation through the changes which are even now taking place. Woman, who has hitherto found her most sacred place in the marriage tie, will never wantonly loosen it; but with her delicate perceptions of moral rectitude, she will also, sooner or later, come to the conclusion that her apparently fair domain flourishes at present over bottomless morasses of human putrescence; and, if she has but once thought the thought to the end, she will not stay her feet for any moral cowardice as to the possible effects of change. There can be no doubt then that this question, like many others, should, from time to time, be theoretically aired. Though the accumulated dust which will be set flying in all directions by that process may prove rather trying to weak lungs and sore eyes, there is no doubt that the act is a salutary one, and the more disagreeable it is the more should the author be thanked for taking the office into his own hands.

From a literary point of view we cannot award the same unqualified praise to "*The Earthward Pilgrimage*," which most unreservedly we give to its moral qualities. We find in it a certain crudity of material and a diffuseness of expression which often seems to grope around its object rather than hit straight at the heart of it. In one word, the matter collected by vast and varied reading has not exactly been fused in the heat of the writer's own mind, and hence to emerge a re-shapen whole. The parts might, like ore which has particles of its original bed still clinging to it, be tracked back to various layers of thought.

But this, we fancy, is less a characteristic of Mr. Conway's method than of the American literary process generally. It seems as if the boundlessness and wealth of the world possessed such an irresistible charm for this young, impetuous nation, that its writers rush headlong to the four quarters of the globe to gather in their multitudinous facts, while scarcely allowing themselves sufficient time to let the accumulated seeds germinate afresh in the soil of their own minds. What their literature chiefly lacks (with some remarkable exceptions of course) is that distinguishing flavor which imparts to a product of the intellect somewhat of the quality of good wine, where the peculiar earthy qualities which nourished it now linger on the palate, transmuted into an ethereal bloom of taste.

It would, however, be ungracious and hypercritical to dismiss a book, which will doubtless do more effectual work than many more labored productions, with any words of dissent or dispraise. What is urgently required in England is precisely work of a kind that shall leaven the thought of the great mass of readers. In Germany and France the modern era of free thought has long ago been victoriously ushered in by such master minds as Lessing and Voltaire. In England, on the other hand (though at one time in the van of both these nations as regards philosophical speculation of the boldest kind), the fact of the body of the people being steeped in Puritanism necessitates that the work shall be done over again in a more popular form. The surest way of accomplishing this is by propelling the shafts aimed at

superannuated myths and dogmas on the light breath of *persiflage*. The chapters in which Mr. Conway has succeeded in raising a hearty laugh at the cost of the venerable anachronisms that still flourish amongst us are, in our opinion, the most useful as well as the most brilliant ones of his book.

MATHILDE BLIND.

SONG-TIDE, and other Poems. By Philip Bourke Marston. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1871.

Mr. Marston, who here prints his first volume of poems, is a son of the editor of "The London Athenæum," and has been afflicted with blindness from an early age. As we read, however, we are disposed to imagine that he would resent our saying he has been afflicted; for the day shines in these verses, the color of roses and the sky are revealed as by sight, the forms of women, the outlines of landscapes, are clearly defined. This objective life is a rather surprising element to observe here. But the poems chiefly deal with the moods of love, absence, anticipation, the joys of music, the subjective life of passion. Sometimes the page is a little too Swinburnish. Where? asks instantly the reader who dotes upon being referred to an indelicacy, and likes a critic whose deprecation points a passage clearly with page and line.

There are fifty or more sonnets, which seem to us the best, though not, perhaps, the most highly colored and attractive portion of the volume. They show a refined and gentle taste, and a musical ear. And their simplicity is a good omen for Mr. Marston, for when he reaches a more mature expression, and busies himself with subjects of a longer breath, he will be fore-armed against the new tendency to verbal dexterities and conflagrations of style.

J. W.

LITTLE MEN. By Louisa M. Alcott. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1871.

A delightful book for the young — and the oldest grow young as they turn its pages. Miss Alcott deserves and receives, we know, the heartfelt thanks of all little men and women the world over where her books have found their way. The publishers' report shows that everybody who read "Little Women" is reading "Little Men," and they will not regret it, we are sure.